

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
LIBRARY



BOOK NUMBER 1
Ag854
350475

ELEMENTS OF PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION

PRINCIPLES AND TECHNIQUES

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
GRADUATE SCHOOL



APRIL TO JUNE, 1935

*A Short Course in the
Administration of Human Relations in the
Public Service*

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
LIBRARY



~~GRADUATE SCHOOL COLLECTION~~

BOOK NUMBER

1
Ag 854
350475

X-57
224
50

ELEMENTS OF PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION

PRINCIPLES AND TECHNIQUES

BRINGS TOGETHER

LECTURES AND PROBLEMS

Which Were Given in a Short Course Held in the
U. S. Department of Agriculture Graduate School
from April 5 to June 7, 1935



Library, U. S. Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
GRADUATE SCHOOL

1935

Copyright 1935
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
GRADUATE SCHOOL

Published July, 1935

Individuals or institutions cooperating
with the Graduate School public em-
ployee training will be given permis-
sion to use this material on prior
application to the School.

LECTURES AND PROBLEMS

Which Were Given in a Short Course Held in the
U. S. Department of Agriculture Graduate School
from April 5 to June 7, 1935

PETER KEPLINGER

Forest Service, Chairman in Charge of Course

A. C. EDWARDS

Agricultural Economics, Coordinator of Course

Assisted by

DISCUSSION GROUP LEADERS

H. D. POWERS

General Accounting Office

MARIANNE O'NEIL

Bureau of the Budget

LEONARD KEMP

Commerce

O. C. SHORT

Commerce

J. F. BOBER

Labor

ROY HEADLEY

Agriculture

E. W. BROWNE

Agriculture

W. B. WISE

Agriculture

FRANK LOMBARD

Agriculture

ADELAIDE ZIPPERSTEIN

Agriculture

FRANK CURRAN

Agriculture

ALTON T. MURRAY

Agriculture

LESTER L. EVANS

Agriculture

HARRY L. KEBRIC

Agriculture

JOHN GRAY

Agriculture

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
FOREWORD. By Dr. A. F. Woods.....	vii
LECTURE I. ART OF MANAGEMENT	1
By Leonard D. White, Professor of Public Administration, University of Chicago and Member of the United States Civil Service Commission.	
Problem 1	10
Comments on discussions of problem 1	11
LECTURE II. HOW EXECUTIVES CAN BECOME LEADERS	12
By Ordway Tead, Lecturer in Personnel Administration, Columbia University, Editor Business Books, Harpers.	
Problem 2	21
Comments on discussions of problem 2.....	22
LECTURE III. NON-FINANCIAL INCENTIVES	24
By John H. Williams, Consulting Industrial Engineer, New York.	
Problem 3	29
Comments on discussion of problem 3.....	31
LECTURE IV. TECHNIQUES OF SUPERVISION	34
By H. S. Person, Consultant in Business Economics and Management, N. Y.	
Problem 4	40
Comments on discussions of problem 4	43
LECTURE V. TECHNIQUES OF SUPERVISION— <i>Continued</i>	45
By Dr. H. S. Person.	
Problem 5	51
Comments on discussions of problem 5	53
LECTURE VII. TRAINING	54
By W. J. Donald, Managing Director of National Electrical Manufacturers Association.	
Problem 6	62
Comments on discussions of problem 6	63
LECTURE VIII. COMPLAINTS	65
By F. A. Silcox, Chief, Forest Service, Formerly Industrial Relations Expert, N. Y.	
Problem 7	72
Comments on discussions of problem 7	72

	PAGE
LECTURE IX. DISCIPLINE	75
By Herman Feldman, Professor of Industrial Relations, Amos Tuck School, Dartmouth.	
Problem 8	83
Comments on discussions of problem 8.....	84
LECTURE X. SUMMARY AND APPLICATION	86
By W. W. Stockberger, Director of Personnel, Department of Agriculture.	
Problem 9	96
Comments on discussions of problem 9	98
BIBLIOGRAPHY—BOOKS AND PERIODICALS ON PERSONNEL AND RELATED SUBJECTS	101

FOREWORD

A special 10-week course in "Elements of Personnel Administration" was given in the Graduate School of the Department of Agriculture on Friday afternoons from 4:45 to 6:15 P.M., starting April 5. It was open to all government employees in Washington, D. C., especially those interested in preparing themselves for supervisory positions, or who were holding supervisory positions. There were no special prerequisites. The fee for the course was \$5.00. It could be taken for credit (one semester hour) or merely audited. About 250 pages of outside reading, in addition to examinations, was required for those desiring credit. Seven hundred sixty-six registered for the course.

This course was designed to fill a demand in the Federal Service for a basic course of training in personnel administration that would reach, and be open to, all government employees.

The enrollees were more than half from outside the Department of Agriculture, coming in all from forty-seven units, representing practically every department, office or independent Federal agency in Washington.

In order to insure breadth of view, lecturers were selected representing the industrial and scholastic fields as well as the governmental. Each lecturer has achieved national recognition for outstanding work in some section of the personnel field.

The method used in conducting the course was as follows: The lectures were given in the department auditorium. At each lecture a problem was handed out for study and written discussion or comment. A selected few of the discussions handed in were mimeographed, together with comments by Mr. P. Keplinger, course chairman. The class was also divided into discussion groups for oral discussion. In addition, three examinations of the true and false character were held. A selected list of reference books were made available by the Library, which was kept open after hours for the accommodation of students from other departments.

The lectures, the problems, the comments on discussions, and the Library references are assembled in this publication, except for lecture six, which contained material not yet available for publication. The lectures were prepared for printing from stenographic reports and, while not originally designed for printing, are believed to be sufficiently clear for that purpose.

The Graduate School of the Department plans to offer additional courses in this field during the winter semester of 1936. No courses are conducted by correspondence.

Copies of the course, so far as available, may be obtained by workers in the field services for 35 cents from the Graduate School, 4090 South Building, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C. Remittances should be made by Post Office money order, to Treasurer, Graduate School, U. S. D. A.

A. F. WOODS,
Director.

LECTURE I

ART OF MANAGEMENT

By LEONARD D. WHITE

IN OPENING this series of ten lectures on the Management of Personnel, may I pause to say at the outset that there are few subjects which are more worthy of study than this. The Department of Agriculture is entitled to credit for having taken the first step in presenting this series of lectures on so important a subject. Although we have been practicing the art of management of personnel ever since the foundation of this government, I do not know that any department has ever before undertaken to inquire systematically how the technique of supervision can be improved. This forward-looking step confirms a point which I made a few weeks ago when I was addressing another audience in this room when I said that the Department of Agriculture had the reputation of being one of the most progressive and most intelligently managed of all the departments of government in Washington.

The subject of management or supervision of personnel is a large one, and had we time to explore the ground completely it might well lead us into practically every phase of personnel work. It is the purpose of this course as I understand it to focus attention not so much on the law of public officers or the rules and regulations of the Civil Service Commission, but rather on those human relations which exist between supervisors and subordinates, and on the wholesome nature of which depends so greatly the happy and successful work of each of us.

May I, therefore, at the outset put to one side any consideration of such matters as the technique of testing and the rules of certification, which are of primary interest to the Civil Service Commission. May I also set aside the complicated work of record keeping which absorbs so much time both in the Civil Service Commission and in the departments. Furthermore, I propose to dismiss discussion of the technical aspects of classification, although good classification is certainly one of the elements of proper management. You will also be pleased to know that I shall not undertake to repeat the rules and regulations of the Civil Service Commission. Finally, I discard for the present purpose the decisions of the Comptroller General and the Attorney General with reference to personnel, not because in particular cases they may not have some bearing on the question of good supervision, but because in general a study of this source of information about personnel work would lead us too far afield.

As I understand it, the fundamental question to which we seek answer in this course of lectures is, what makes a job in the civil service worth while; what can be done, and what should be done to make work with the government more worth while than it is, more

interesting, more stimulating, more full of opportunity, more challenging. Back of this basic question lie two considerations, each of which is of great importance. The first of these is, that an active, energetic and contented personnel is able to transact public business more effectively and more intelligently than a group of men and women who work under a sense of injustice and grievance. Perhaps even more important from the broad human point of view is the second consideration, that, humanly speaking, our work lives ought to be as full of satisfaction and as free from limitation and irritation as possible in an imperfect world.

Whether from the point of view of more effective transaction of government work or from the point of view from creating a happy and stimulating work environment, the problem of making government jobs more worth while is of primary importance.

We must recognize at the outset that part of the answer to the problem falls outside the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission and of the departments themselves, for some work conditions are governed by legislation and by appropriation acts, all of which create conditions which civil service staffs have to accept. The basic civil service requirements, the scales of pay, the particular legal provisions of the economy acts, and other phases of personnel management are fixed in statute beyond the reach of any supervisor, no matter how conscientious or how sympathetic he may be.

A large part of the task of making government work worth while can, however, be faced by supervisors in high and low position with the knowledge that they have it in their power to make good working conditions and thus to expedite business and create a high morale within their organization; or conversely, they have it in their power by lack of application or understanding to create stresses and strains within their organization which lower morale and which cumulatively make trouble.

" In my judgment, the primary responsibility for making government jobs satisfying and interesting rests both with the employee and with the supervisor. If supervision is good, work results tend to be good; if supervision is bad, work results tend to be poor. It is undoubtedly true that in most government offices supervision and management are generally not obviously bad; and on the other hand, if my very brief observation is dependable, they are not at times strikingly good. There are, however, a whole range of considerations and a large number of specific devices which are known and tested, all of which taken together make it possible for supervisors to do a much better job of supervision. It is one of the purposes of this course of lectures to set forth some of the management methods which already are in use in many cases in different government offices and which in other cases have been tested in industrial employment.

May we turn for a moment to analyze the process of supervision itself. The simplest type of supervision arises when only two persons are involved, a supervisor and a subordinate. A famous literary case which will illustrate the point is the story of Robinson Crusoe, who supervised his man Friday on Robinson Crusoe's isle. This type of 1-1 relationship, of course, is not commonly found in government office

and presents the simplest kind of supervisory problem. It may, however, be a very real problem, and I have known of cases where an unfortunate secretary suffered deeply on account of the stupidity of her boss.

The 1-1 relationship quickly develops into a 1-2 relationship where the supervisor has two subordinates and where the possibilities of human action and reaction begin to increase in geometrically proportion. Now the problem is not merely one of adjusting the personalities of two persons each to the other, but of adjusting three persons each to the other. Coordination of effort, one task of supervision, expands in scope. Possibility of tension may develop not merely between supervisor and a subordinate but between subordinate and subordinate, or between the two of them collectively and the superior. The 1-2 supervisory relationship readily expands into the one-many relationship. This may involve, in extreme cases where routine work especially is involved, one supervisor to twenty or thirty or forty subordinates.

As soon, however, as the superior-subordinate-supervisory relationship expands into such numbers, a new administrative device comes into existence. The one supervisor finds it impossible to deal effectively with twenty or thirty or more subordinates, and consequently he introduces an assistant supervisor, who takes a part of the load.

We then have a supervisory situation built on two levels instead of one which may be expressed in the formula 1-1-several. This formula in turn rapidly expands into a situation where two or three assistant supervisors may be required and we have the formula 1-3-several.

This type of analysis can readily be developed until it expands to correspond to such a huge organization as the Department of Agriculture, where tier upon tier of supervisory responsibility is built up ultimately to the Secretary of Agriculture himself. At each level of supervisory responsibility a somewhat different problem is put, and it is obvious that the difficulty of supervision and correspondingly the necessity for more careful attention to supervision increases with the size of the organization and with the building up of an extensive organization.

Such an elaborate organization is characteristic of most government departments. The simple types of supervision are less common than the complex types. Each type, however, when analyzed into its elements presents the face to face primary contact of individual with individual, one a supervisor, the other a subordinate, or one a higher supervisor, the other an intermediate or lower supervisor. The essential fact of supervision is that it is a person-to-person contact which for its successful performance depends upon the satisfactory adjustment of individual to individual. The complex of interrelations among persons increases the larger the organization, and the number of disturbing factors increases in geometrical ratio, but at the bottom of it all is the immediate direct personal contact between John Jones and Bill Smith and Mary Brown. If these contacts and personal adjustments are worked out successfully, supervision is good, organization is wholesome, production is satisfactory, and morale is high.

Too great importance can not be attached to these relationships, and in the course of the following lectures much will be said about the method by which they can be properly established and happily maintained.

May we now turn from this brief analysis of the framework within which the technique of supervision operates to look more closely at the art of supervision and management itself. As we look around at the way in which different supervisors handle their staff, we see many different methods actually at work. Each method represents the particular way in which one type of personality approaches a task, modified by the reaction which these supervisory methods develop in the subordinate group. Obviously it is impossible to catalog all the different types of supervisors and all the different methods of supervision. It will be helpful, however, to point out certain sharply contrasting types which may serve as guideposts to the more accurate understanding of related types. I shall suggest three types of supervisors, all of which may be clearly differentiated and of which I suppose examples may be found in any large department. These types I call the military type, the foreman type, and the leadership type. The names suggest the different attributes of each supervisory type, but I shall develop each of them in somewhat greater detail.

The military type is, of course, peculiar to the Army and the Navy. It rests upon an officer class in which the right of command is specifically located. It proceeds upon the basis of implicit and complete obedience under all circumstances, even to the risk of life and limb in time of peace or in time of war. It requires from the subordinate, the rank and file, nothing more and nothing less than the complete performance of each command. The subordinate is in no position to question the wisdom of the command received from his superior officer, nor can he delay or equivocate in its performance, nor can he resign if he is dissatisfied. The military type of supervision is buttressed with the insignia of office, with the ceremony of salute, and other devices intended to distinguish the officer from the man and to emphasize the right of the officer to command and the duty of the subordinate to obey.

This is a type of supervision which in a military establishment is effective, clean cut, and universal. However useful in military circles, it is not a type of supervision which can be recommended for civil administration. It is not conducive to developing morale in a civil organization. It tends too easily to develop arrogance, an overbearing manner, and the technique of domination rather than leadership. Variations of the military type of supervision can be found in some public offices. These cases represent unhappy illustrations of the power complex, a psychological disaster which affects many persons high and low. The saving grace of the power complex in Napoleonic figures is that great historic results may be achieved by it. The power complex in a unit supervisor or a division chief has no such saving grace and would be funny if it were not tragic in its consequences to those unhappy subordinates who may be subject to this type of supervision. The military type is seldom helpful in civil administration, so far as my observation leads. Too frequently this type of overbearing

management is the reflection of an inferiority complex or a sense of insecurity on the part of the supervisory officer. Sometimes it is due to ignorance of the fact that there are other ways of securing results. These methods create an uncomfortable situation certainly for those under supervision and quite often without doubt for the supervisor himself. While quite warranted in insisting upon firmness, such a supervisor may well remember that there are other ways of getting work done than the way which has been formalized by the Army.

Another type of supervision I call the foreman type. This is the type which one may observe perhaps in its purest form in the ditch-digging gang, extending water pipes on the outskirts of any American city prior to the depression. The gang itself is frequently composed of a group of immigrants, unaccustomed to the politer forms of social contact. The boss may himself be an immigrant of more or less recent vintage but amply equipped with a command of colloquial English. His method of supervision consists chiefly in bold language, much shouting, and occasional blows, backed up by the threat of instant discharge if the unfortunate ditch-digger fails to please his supervisor, the foreman. This kind of supervision is rough and ready and is exclusively concerned with getting the ditch dug, not with the social or psychological consequences of the process of supervision.

Happily this type of supervision is uncommon in public offices, but it is not unknown. Its emphasis on results—that is, getting the ditch dug—is probably the almost universal emphasis in public office as well. Its disregard of the social and psychological consequences of the supervision itself is also common elsewhere. I refer to this case chiefly to make the point that the general objective of intelligent supervision in government office is at least twofold: one object being to get the work done whatever it may be, a second object to create wholesome and pleasant working conditions while the work is being done. Of this more later.

The third type of supervision is what I call, for lack of a better term, the leadership type. Here appeal is made less to command or to force than to a sense of cooperation and of teamwork. A recent English report referred to "the accepted principles of teamwork," and these principles might well stand as a symbol of a more enlightened type of supervision in civil service than either of the two types which I have just suggested.

The supervisor who conforms to this constructive type of management is entitled to proper recognition as the captain of the team, but he recognizes that he is not the whole team. He calls the play, but the team steps into action as a team for the achievement of a common purpose and not for the glorification or advantage of the supervisor. The team responds not through fear of consequences but through respect and regard. This type of a supervisor prefers to build the morale of his group on mutual respect and loyalty, not on coercion or loud talk. He builds up initiative instead of repressing it; he releases energy instead of sterilizing it; he creates morale instead of destroying it. He is a constructive force, not merely a productive machine. He is constantly on guard to preserve an unbiased and impartial attitude with reference to his staff. He plays no favorites,

and not only preserves an impartial attitude but seeks to be so obviously unbiased that no one can suspect any prejudice in his official relationships. As I view the public service, he represents the type of management and supervision which should be taken as a model in preference to either the military type or the foreman type.

Other types of management might readily be described, but I will allow these three examples to stand as sharply different ways in which the general task of management may be approached. A very great deal depends upon the spirit in which the supervisor undertakes his work, and although no supervisor will correspond precisely to the description which I have given of these three types, many supervisors will correspond fairly closely to one or to the other. In the interest of a wholesome public service, the military type and the foreman type should be discarded as rapidly as we can make our adjustment to a more constructive method of supervision.

Assuming, therefore, that the leadership type of management is accepted as the general pattern, we may proceed next to inquire what techniques of supervision may be worked out. Here I must take refuge in the remark that this is the introductory lecture and that you will not expect me to be too specific about the specific methods of supervision which can be used in particular cases in conformity with the general form of leadership which I suggest for your approval. These special techniques will be the subject matter of more than one of the succeeding lectures, and I hope by the end of the course many specific suggestions will be made for your consideration.

Even in an introductory lecture, however, something needs to be said in a general way about the application of different techniques of management. It is of great importance to recognize the doctrine of variability in this rather intimate human relationship of superior-subordinate. Any formalized ironclad rulebook system of supervision is bound to be inadequate and in many cases productive of more harm than good. A supervisor has to be eternally vigilant to apply particular methods of supervision in the particular case where they are appropriate, and to avoid methods of management which are not suited to the persons or to the groups which are being directed.

Any supervisor who studies his subordinates even in the slightest degree quickly recognizes great variations among them. He sees the sensitive employee and the hard-boiled; he observes the responsive and the irresponsible; he learns to know the loyal and the disloyal; he sees the quick and the dull. He may even contrast with his normal group of psychologically well-balanced subordinates one or more who are distinctly neurotic or psychopathic. He becomes familiar with the broad difference between the two psychological types, the extravert and the introvert.

It may be worth while to pause at this moment to say, if you do not happen to be familiar with these psychological terms, that they represent two broad categories of human personality and that no slightest stigma attaches to either type. The extravert is characteristically the sociable, talkative, sometimes bustling sort of a person who makes contacts easily, whose imagination runs freely, and who

enjoys social life. The extravert deals with persons and things rather than with ideas and books.

The introvert on the other hand is an introspective type, not sociably inclined, preferring to work as a lone wolf rather than as a member of a group. He lives within himself rather than externally with the world at large. He is more likely to be interested in books and ideas than he is in persons and movements. He may be quite as valuable a citizen as the extravert, but he represents a different psychological type.

Obviously, intelligent supervision will use different methods in dealing with an extravert than in dealing with an introvert, just as an intelligent supervisor would react differently to a hard-boiled subordinate as contrasted with a sensitive soul. Perhaps I should add that a supervisor should act differently in these cases rather than imply that he always does.

Time will not permit me to develop these different human types and variations, but I do wish to emphasize the exceeding importance of adapting supervisory methods to the type of person who is being supervised. One method of supervision, however good it may be for Mary Brown, may be absolutely fatal for Sally Jones. I can not help but believe that a great deal of the unhappiness which one encounters in some sections of the public service is due to the simple fact that supervisors have not been intelligent in their task of supervision on account of failure to recognize the fundamental differences in human response which are represented by some of the psychological types which I have just described.

With the necessity, therefore, of adapting means to ends firmly fixed in our minds, may I proceed to consider briefly the two major types of supervision with which all supervisors are from time to time concerned. One type of supervision may be called broadly the repressive and corrective; the other type is the constructive and developmental.

The repressive and corrective type of supervision is sufficiently common to require little discussion. It may be merely correcting a misunderstanding of work assignment in which no emotional tension is created; it may mean the correction of errors in the construction of a statistical table; it may mean caution about too frequent tardiness; it may involve a warning about the consequences of failure to pay one's debts. Occasionally it may involve reference to the disadvantage of excessive use of intoxicants. In short, from time to time employees wittingly or unwittingly put themselves in a position where it is necessary and proper for a supervisor to warn, reprimand or punish. So long as human nature remains imperfect, and I suppose these imperfections will outlast the New Deal, we must expect supervisors to be prepared to supervise in this sense of the term. Supervisors certainly should not shrink from strong medicine where this dose is indicated.

The other major type of supervision is what I call constructive and developmental. Here the supervisor is not criticising or correcting or warning an employee, but is taking affirmative steps to improve the situation in which the employee finds himself. There are many

illustrations of ways in which such constructive supervision may take place. One important aspect is to give attention to the social adjustment of newcomers to an office. Those who have been in Washington for many years do not realize how difficult it is at times for new employees to fit into the social life of their group or of the community. Supervisors can be helpful at this point.

It might well be a continuing interest of supervisors to recommend to their employees further educational opportunities, so that these employees may progressively fit themselves for promotion to higher positions. The number of such opportunities in Washington is steadily increasing. Care should be taken, however, to make it clear to the employees in one's office that they are under no compulsion to take training or to attend any courses. In the Civil Service Commission we have a weekly seminar in civil service practice. Attendance at this meeting is entirely voluntary, and in my opinion this is one of the chief reasons why it is working so successfully.

A skillful supervisor will try to keep the employee continuously interested in his work. This will require a good deal of skill in varying assignments so that a man or woman will not be kept indefinitely at the same desk on the same piece of work. These changing assignments are a definite stimulus and, furthermore, give opportunity to observe to what degree an employee may have capacity for growth into greater responsibility.

A skillful supervisor will be prepared at proper times to advise his subordinates on the rather delicate topic of personal adjustment. Some of us have difficult personalities showing awkward humps and sometimes sharp corners which make smooth adjustment of one to another more difficult than is really necessary. A skillful supervisor can do much to bring down some of the lightning rods and smooth out some of the humps to the great advantage of everyone concerned. At this point also I may say that a skillful supervisor will take care in making assignments to avoid placing together two persons whose individualities are antagonistic. Too much wear and tear in public office is caused by the inability of clashing personalities to get away from each other's sphere of influence.

This suggests a further interest which intelligent supervisors will have in their subordinates, a much more elastic opportunity for transfer than we have at the present time. A whole lecture might well be given on this subject, but I will content myself with saying that greater opportunity for transfer and by implication for promotion is one of the crying needs of the civil service.

This leads me to suggest a proposition which everyone will agree to in principle but which only too few supervisors will accept in practice. The proposition is that even the very best employee in one's group ought to be given the free opportunity to move to another office whenever opportunity for the improvement of his position appears. I am aware of the fact that altogether too often a really able employee is carefully concealed from the knowledge of another office or section so that no competing offer will be made to him. This exceedingly short-sighted policy represents the complete perversion of proper management.

In short, the constructive and developmental type of supervision is interested in the public service as a whole and not merely in the narrow welfare of the particular tiny unit over which the supervisor presides. Constructive supervision is interested in the persons supervised as well as in the maintenance of "law and order," and to the extent that the employees are helped by constructive supervision, to this extent the interest of the government is served.

Supervisors must eternally keep in mind the fact that their attitude toward their staff is quickly sensed by their subordinates, and that this attitude is reflected throughout the section or division over which they preside. Supervisors must always remember, too, that the greater respect the employees have for them the more completely they will enjoy their work and the more effective will be the work of the unit.

By and large we have had too much repressive and corrective supervision in the public service. We have not had enough constructive and developmental supervision. The former is relatively easy; the latter calls for qualities of personal leadership and insight which are difficult and relatively rare. We can not be content, however, with the quality of our supervision until we have a proper balance of the two types which I have been describing. Some employees will require heavy doses of repression in order to keep them within the limit of official conduct. Most employees respond to the helpful influences of constructive supervision, and it may even appear that some lost souls for whom harsh control has been a long-time prescription may themselves respond to a sunnier and more hopeful type of official contact.

In presenting this point of view, may I say that the objective is not mere sentimentality. Nor need supervisors concern themselves about the danger of building up their subordinates to the point where they will take away their own supervisory jobs. The object in view is definitely to improve the public service by making it a more wholesome place in which to work. If the public service is more wholesome, greater interest in work will follow automatically and greater accomplishment. All of this will be reflected in hard dollars and cents savings to the taxpayer, and even Federal employees, having recently completed their income tax returns, can appreciate the importance of this consideration.

If the public service is a more wholesome place in which to work and live, it will have a greater attractiveness not only for those who are in the service now but for those young people graduating from high schools and colleges who are now deciding whether to enter industry or the government service.

As I have said on other occasions, it is of fundamental importance that some of the best of these young high school and college graduates choose the public service for their career. Intelligent supervision will make it easier for them to come into the service of the state instead of seeking their life work in private lines.

May I now bring this lecture to a close by attempting to summarize the main points which I should like to leave with you.

1. Personnel management and supervision is one of the most useful means of creating an efficient and contented organization.

2. The primary responsibility for creating contentment and efficiency in an office rests with the supervisor, together with the employee himself.

3. Supervision may involve merely a 1-1 relationship, or it may involve a one-many relationship, or it may expand into a series of superior-subordinate relationships involving three or more tiers of responsibility.

4. The more complex the organization the more difficult and the more important becomes the technique of management.

5. Three different types of supervision may be distinguished. They are the military type, the foreman type, and the leadership type.

6. My own preference is strongly for the leadership type of management.

7. Any type of supervision must recognize great variations in human personality and must adapt the type of supervision to the type of personality in question.

8. Two general patterns of supervision may be distinguished—the one called the repressive and corrective, the other may be called the constructive and developmental.

9. By and large, we have had too much repressive supervision and too little constructive.

10. Improvement in supervision is valuable not merely because it leads to an appreciable increase in efficiency but because it makes the public service a more humane place in which to live and to work.

* * *

PERSONNEL PROBLEM No. 1

Consider the following actual case, which came to our notice only recently. It is given in the words of the employee except for changes necessary to prevent identification.

"I feel sure that the man in charge of our section is holding me back. I have asked several times for a change and have been told each time that I am being considered.

"Frankly, I have reason to believe that I am so good on my present job that my boss does not want to lose me. He has as good as told me so. He knows that I do good work and that I can do higher grade work, but when there is an opportunity to advance, somebody else gets it. One can, it seems, do their work too well for their own good."

1. Assuming that this statement is basically true, what type of supervisor would you say he is; how would you classify him? Answer briefly.

2. Assuming that the statement is not basically true but that the employee feels that it is, what type of supervision does he need?

3. In either case, what should the employee do?

COMMENTS ON DISCUSSIONS

Problem No. 1.

A very large proportion looked at the question purely from the viewpoint of the interest of the employee. Is the interest of the employee the only interest to be considered in good personnel administration? What about the interest of the supervisor? And the interest of the employer? Whether in Government or in industry employees are hired not to advance themselves but to help in the accomplishment of an objective. Then why should not this objective be given first consideration?

It is generally true that the objective will be advanced most when employees are used on the highest type of work for which they are prepared and for that reason the best trained employee should usually be advanced. Anyhow, as nearly everyone said, it is a good thing to have an understanding with the boss. A supervisor, like the rest of us, is inclined to look at things from his own point of view, but mostly they can see yours also if given the opportunity.

LECTURE II

HOW EXECUTIVES CAN BECOME LEADERS

By ORDWAY TEAD

IT IS with a great deal of pleasure that after a lapse of eighteen years I come back for a brief period on the government payroll! And I come back, it seems, in somewhat the same rôle as that I was in during the war, namely, in the effort to help government employees who are supervising the work of others to make their services as supervisors more effective. That is what I happened to be doing for the government in war-time.

There is a story of speak-easy days which serves to bring out a point I wish to make. A man was standing at the bar taking a drink and repeating very vigorously to the air, "No, No." Another gentleman, observing, saw him ask for another drink and utter "No, No; a thousand times No." He repeated this with the third drink. Finally, this other gentleman stepping up to him said, "Pardon me, but would you mind telling what you are so vehement in saying 'No, No,' about?" "It is this way," was the reply, "I am secretary to a bank president and spend all my time all day saying, 'Yes, Yes, Yes,' and I am pretty fed up on it!"

I do not know that the problem of the man who has to say "Yes, Yes" and of the other man who expects it, is confined necessarily to bank presidents and their secretaries. I am inclined to think that this lack of harmony which the story illustrates may creep into other kinds of managerial contacts.

I asked for the privilege of talking to you about the problem of how executives can become leaders, because, it seems to me, that is one of the crucial needs of our time. I want to take a moment to explain why it seems to me that an effort should be made to change the emphasis from mere executive work to what I shall define as a leading emphasis. I think there are three reasons why we have to concern ourselves a little with the quality of executive work. *First*, because of the nature of the executive job itself; *second*, because we know, because it has been brought home to us through psychological study, the deficiencies of bossing, of mere command, of the exercise of power; *third*, because our advance into an understanding of human nature brings recognition of the fact that there are certain cravings in human nature which a leading technique satisfies as a bossing technique does not.

May I take a moment to suggest what the executive job is typically in almost every type of work. It means, at one level and another, planning and defining the policy to be carried out; organizing the activity of oneself and others; supervising the progress of work; giving the general orders as to how work should be carried out; transmitting policy from the top down; training in techniques and responsibility;

the coordination of the related efforts of a number of people; the vitalizing and stimulating of the people in the organization to do their best; keeping up the morale of those working together to get something done. Now, it is this last, this vitalizing, this stimulating, this charging with a degree of interest and enthusiasm which is the big contribution which leading offers anyone in addition to the essential executive duties which are always characteristic. This recognition of the need for stimulating and vitalizing realizes that people do not automatically respond well. There is need for some outside force to make the efforts of men become effectively related in a united drive. That need the real leader supplies.

I can quickly illustrate what I mean here by reference to a corporation in the middle west where, in point of policy, method and procedure, what we regard as good personnel practice was well carried out. The personnel head of the corporation took me to see the various kinds of activities, describing the features that they had, and it was all splendid. Yet when I got back to his office, he said, "Despite all this that you see, we do not feel that our employees rise to it. We do not feel that we get the morale that you would think we were entitled to as a result of the kind of things that are being done here." I said, "Why is that?" He smiled, and reminded me that we had just been in the office of the president of the company but we had gone through two or three secretarial doors to get there. There was a mahogany desk and behind it sat a man curt and brusque in manner. He was the executive head; but he was no leader. And the organization suffered for lack of a personal warmth and glow at the top.

What often happens is that we never get down from the top of our organizations any effort to interpret to our people what it is that is being done, what it is that we are trying to do. There is a failure to supply leadership. We go through certain motions, but the motions are not any good if there is not that vitalizing, personalizing, democratic quality down through, that really makes a quickening, heartening influence which yields cooperation.

Now, the deficiencies of bossing are something that we really know about today. Bossing is getting things done because somebody imposes his or her will upon the will of somebody else. You'd be surprised how much of this still exists in factories and elsewhere. You can still see on foremen's desks a card which says, "If you want to know who's boss around here, just start something!" This attitude is still much too prevalent in the way of thinking and dealing of people who are in charge. It is the attitude of, "Theirs not to reason why, theirs but to do or die."

The other way is not the mere imposition of one's will, imposed with a motive more or less of fear. The new way says you are trying to get something done because people themselves become anxious to want to do it. That is the difference. It is not that the end, the result, the getting something done is so different. The great difference is *how* it is that people are brought to achieve certain results. In the bossing method, fear is the motive largely being employed. In leading it is the welling up from within, it is the internal drive of all towards achieving the results in view.

Also, bossing tends not to realize that, in the relationship of one directing to those being directed, much of what has to be done is in the nature of the particular situation, not in the personal factors involved. One doesn't occupy a directive post merely by virtue of personal qualities. One exercises responsibility because a position is there which requires that certain responsibility be assumed and that certain directive influences be kept going. Leading and executive work have always to be thought of as having those two phases, the quality which the man or woman brings to the job and also the fact that the situation or position which they occupy *requires* certain directive activities.

In industry it is more and more becoming a slogan that "good training takes the place of orders"; that if standard practices in methods and sequences of operation, standards of quantity and quality performance have been well established and well conceived, the need for constant interference and order giving on the part of supervisors becomes much reduced. That is another reason why it is that the bossing notion has lost ground. The training emphasis, the emphasis on subordination of orders to standard practice, has gained as we have improved organization structure and technique.

Perhaps as important as any of the reasons why leading emphasis is coming to attention today has to do with what I shall call *people's craving to be led*. I'd like to have you visualize with me how pervasive, how inclusive throughout our life, excepting only when we are asleep, is the fact of moving and living and having our being through organization, through groups of some sort. Not merely in work relationships but in civics, play, religious activity, we function for the most part in group relationship, in organized activities. To a certain extent, that is natural to us. But I am not at all sure that we can say that the inclusive character of organized effort is entirely natural to us. The fact that every minute we are shoulder to shoulder and having to make adjustment to one another's personalities is not natural. And in both business and government organizations, when the work organization becomes increasingly large in size and the dangers of impersonality of relationship arise, you find a real danger that the individual will be lost to himself, will feel estranged, will feel unhappy, will feel that he is just going through the motions of a necessary job that brings in the pay, but will not feel what he is entitled to feel, namely, that in and through the experience of working with others in association he gets a kick, he gets a thrill, he gets the sense of satisfying and realizing his own personality, his sense and desire for gratifying development and expression.

If we can't make the organized group activities which occupy the great bulk of our working hours satisfying, happy mediums of self-expression for people, we are in a very bad way in our modern life, because so much of it is spent in groups. I believe this is not an impossible and unreasonable challenge that we make to organizations and their leaders, to ask that they create a situation in which fulfillment in the individual worker comes in and through the kind of thing he is doing hour by hour, associatedly, with others at work.

I ran across this sentence the other day; it was applied to political activity: "Nothing bolsters up morale like victory." That sentence pulled me up with a jolt. I said to myself: In how many organizations are people working where the experience of *victory* is an occasionally gratifying experience for the rank and file of the people? Isn't there likely to be in the organizations with which you and I have our experiences the danger of routine, monotonized, repetitious experience in which the highlights, in which enthusiasm and measures of attainment rarely occur? And doesn't it become a genuine duty of executive leaders to plan the flow and scheme of work so that ever so often something which in the work set-up is equivalent to victory can be achieved by all? The benefits, the by-products, the stimulating, exhilarating, enthusing influences of that kind of victory can, I am sure, be immeasurably beneficial in all kinds of organizations.

It seems to me that in the pressure of organized contacts upon us in modern life and with the large proportion of our time that we all necessarily spend at work, there is need that we somehow or other occasionally transcend ourselves by occasionally being excited, occasionally having our blood quickened. It is not satisfactory that this kind of experience, this quickening impulse, come to us only vicariously, as, for example, through the movies. That, apparently, is where the enlivening, emotional quality of life does come for many people today! We have, rather, the job of making the relationship to those being led and the way in which they are led, yield us genuine exhilaration, excitement, glamor. This is a demand which human nature makes upon life, and good leading can help to supply it if it will work towards that end.

There is also a real craving for *community* of feeling among us, coming as we do from diverse geographical quarters, with diverse interests and diverse outlooks. The leader's job is to help foster community of interest and community of desire and effort on the part of the people being brought together in organizations.

An industrial executive said to me the other day, "If we do not lead the men" (he was speaking of his plant), "who will?" He recognized in saying this that the craving for leadership is going to try to satisfy itself in one channel, in one outlet, if not in another. And if within the range of one's work effort there is not being supplied that type of leadership which a man will respect and admire, and will love to follow, then there are going to be efforts made by other individuals on the outside, either related to work or to something else, which will enable people to release energy and emotional vigor.

All of this presupposes that I have some definite notion as to what I mean by leading, and I must give a formal definition. *Leading is the activity of influencing people to cooperate to get something done because they want to do it.*

This question of cooperating together to reach some aim becomes, therefore, one of the first elements in this definition. Unless the things you are organized to do commend themselves to people as being reasonable, as being worthy, as being socially significant, you are not going to get the loyalty or the interest that you want. This problem of what the purpose, the goal, the aim, the objective is, is one that

has to be answered even in organizations where it might seem to be perfectly obvious to those who are doing the leading what the answer is. It has to be answered not at the top but at the different levels of administration all the way down. You will find that there are major objectives such as the big idea to be followed through; then there are minor and secondary aims that help to build toward the major objective. It is by no means true that even the leaders of organizations up and down the world have as clear a notion as they always should as to what it is they are trying to do. There should always be the effort to study and then the effort to interpret what is the big idea of our department, our bureau, or section. This is one of the things that the executive leader will start with if he wants to change his emphasis over to a leading emphasis, because it is only as that aim is translated into terms and into experiences all down the line that it is going to be sold to the followers.

Somehow or other the things that the organized group is trying to do must commend themselves to the led because the led find them good. The goal of the organization has to take into account the goal of its people; and those two things are not fundamentally at variance with each other. The goals of its people as individuals are not unreasonable; they are not essentially at odds with the organization goals. People want security for one thing. They want status. They are entitled to have self-respect. They want some sense of progress, development, growth in the process of doing what they have to do. They want self-realization, self-expression, self-satisfaction. And my great point is that this demand upon their work relationships is one they can satisfy under wise leadership. The demand which we all rightfully and insistently make to realize ourselves and to amount to something is consistent with the demand which the organization makes for our creative effort toward the attainment of its goal.

How do you get people to discover that the thing which the organization wants to do is good for them and makes identifying their interest with the group interest a good idea? You do not do it by exhortation alone. You do not preach at people and you do not do it merely by putting up notices on bulletin boards or by having house organs with statements signed by the head of the company or department. People aren't convinced that way. People are not affected permanently by that type of exhortation or formal statement. People are brought to harmony with the purpose of an organization most effectively in one way, as I see it, and that is by getting through their working activity, the experience of *finding it good for them*, of realizing in terms of contacts and associates, in terms of opportunities for advancement and recognition of work well done, that the organization performs and stands for activities which are good, satisfying and legitimate.

There is a famous old saying that a man learns to be a good flute player by playing the flute. A man also learns to be a poor flute player by playing the flute. And that acute observation calls attention to a very important point which bears upon this matter of translating objectives to people. Raw experience does not necessarily bring conviction. The experiences of our employees, of our rank and file,

have very often to be interpreted to them. Here again is where the leader occupies a big rôle. You may have heard with reference to employees of certain companies and even to government employees the remark, "Why, those people don't know when they are well off!" Now, when that comment is made about a group of employees I would say at once that there is evidence of a genuine failure on the part of leaders who have not done a proper interpreting job. If the policies are good and if they are intelligently administered, why should not the people realize how good they are in comparison with what takes place in some other organization where there is not so much mindfulness of people's self-respect, etc.?

One of the jobs of leadership is to interpret the experience that people have so that they may realize that the goals being worked for are good for them and the way in which they are being worked for is satisfying for them. People often have to be made to see when it is true and can be shown that they *do* have a stake in the big idea, that there is something there for them to be loyal to.

At this point I cannot help reminding you, in concluding these few remarks about the importance of the kind of goals, that you *in the government* have a relatively simple problem and a splendid opportunity in interpreting goals to civil servants. You are not trying to vindicate the drawing off from the efforts of your associates of a certain amount of profits for absentee stockholders; you do not have that problem. You do not have to try to make people loyal to a situation where the extent of their stake may be very precarious and very slight, or where the tenure of their positions may be exceedingly uncertain. You have a situation in respect to an organized relationship in the government employ where there is a clear-cut appeal, department by department, of *high-minded public service* supported by a range of long-built-up policies (which, again, ought to be interpreted to the rank and file), policies about security, status, and the rest, which have been developed. I do feel that with the advantage you have in terms of soundness and the high-mindedness of the goals that animate activity in government agencies, there is this further duty which I am not at all sure is being fulfilled, namely, the duty of charging with real emotional conviction those who are associated with you that you are at work upon a vital public service. And this public service does merit cooperative loyalty. The appeal can be made in terms of benefits that accrue to them, to the service and to the public good.

Perhaps you say that we have always been brought up to think that leaders are born and can't be made. It is true, of course, that certain people are born with combinations of talents, equipments, physical and otherwise, that seem to make it easier for them to attain leadership in the world. My point would be that as we have to continue to increase the number of executive positions, top, middle, bottom, all the way through in organizations, we do need people in these myriad posts who are adopting a *leading* mind of attitude. And if we conclude that leaders are born and not made, that we can do nothing with our executives to improve the quality of the work they

do, to improve their leading techniques, we might just as well not be here this afternoon.

When you come to analyze what personal qualities characterize leaders in various walks of life, you realize that there are qualities susceptible to development, to training, and to improvement. I am going to mention briefly, just what seem to be some of the more outstanding qualities which we observe as being significant elements in personality that go to make people more effective when they get into leading situations.

First and foremost is a plentiful endowment of physical and nervous energy. A characteristic that runs throughout the whole range of those who have reached leadership positions with any degree of success is energy. And if we can manage in various ways to conserve and utilize to good effect this energy, we are building on a sound physical and nervous foundation. Energy is, moreover, at the bottom of ability to exhibit courage; it is at the bottom of ability to show persistence; it's at the bottom of the fact that one can be, on occasion if necessary, forceful in the way in which one handles oneself or a situation.

The second qualification would be purposefulness—a clear sense with respect to some goal in life, something to be done, a course to be followed, an end to be gained.

If you have energy and a clear sense of purposefulness in one direction, you are almost bound to get the third quality which is enthusiasm, and that certainly is important. Enthusiasm is a very contagious thing. The world is eager for it and catches something from it.

Friendliness is a quality which good leaders have been able to manifest, and with success—sheer human friendliness.

Another quality is integrity. Where this quality is found we say we "can trust that man." There are different kinds of integrity. The kind of integrity you demand of a minister is not the kind you demand of the captain of a baseball team. But essentially those who are following have to have the sense that "He is a regular fellow and we believe in him." That is the kind of thing I mean by integrity.

You must also have technical mastery. The leader needs to be in reasonably efficient command of the technical instruments and details of the work undertaken. He does not have to be the best one, but he does have to know when work is being well done.

Decisiveness is important because there come occasions in all organized efforts where emergencies arise and there has to be a lead given, a choice made, so that action may proceed.

Intelligence, quickness and acuteness of mental perception, ability to put 2 and 2 together is required. If there is intelligence, it will be possible to develop qualities of imagination which big leaders have, and to encourage the utilization of a sense of humor which is also important.

A good deal of teaching skill can wisely be exercised. And finally, for want of a better word, I use the word *faith*. I think good leaders have faith. They have faith in people, they have faith in human nature, they have faith in effort, they have faith that there is a good, a better, and that the good and the better are worth striving for. You

do not get leaders out of pessimists, cynics, or futilitarians. Faith is an indispensable part of the whole equipment that makes leadership.

Now, if you will review in your mind those qualities, I think you will agree that by paying attention to many of them, real improvement in one's qualities can take place. I have not time to go on and indicate how that might be done, but I have done it elsewhere in my latest book if you should care to follow this through. I am convinced that we *can* add a cubit to our stature in point of skill in combining performances and efforts into a total activity which is leading.

Related to the subject of one's qualities, may I speak a word on the subject of our behavior. We have found in industrial personnel work that a great many people in supervisory positions had failed to recognize, had never been aware of, the fact that elements in their behavior make a difference in their effectiveness. The entire bearing and attitude, even the facial expression of the supervisor, influence others in hour by hour contact with them. There was a prolonged and careful study made involving this problem at the Western Electric Company plant in Chicago several years ago. This study established quite clearly a truth which needs to be shouted from the housetops—that the attitude, the bearing, even the facial expressions, do make an important difference in the happiness and the effectiveness with which we meet and influence and direct others.

Did you ever stop to think when you come to consider our personal bearing how many different adjectives you can apply to it—the supercilious attitude, the grouchy, the preoccupied, the condescending, the bored and the aloof. You can go on and characterize one's appearance and bearing in innumerable ways. These negative attitudes are bad from the point of view of effectiveness. They do not need to be there. There do not need to be bad attitudes detracting from the effectiveness of one's influence. The quickest way to help that situation would be for each of us to have that most unpopular individual, the candid friend, who would tell us that we were supercilious, aloof, etc. At least, we can ask ourselves: Do I scowl? Is my head in the air? Do I refuse to say a courteous "good morning?" Do I recognize people as I pass among them? *By taking thought*, I am sure that problems that have to do with attitude, bearing, appearance, facial expression, can be beneficially considered.

Did you ever stop to think how many different ways there are of giving orders? In the biography of Owen Young there is a statement that Mr. Young never gives an order; it is always phrased in the terms of a polite request, such as, "Don't you think we better do this?" "May we do some dictation now?" How simple it is to phrase the request in a mannerly form, handling the situation in an agreeable, gentlemanly way, as against the abrupt, the crisp, the indifferent way of doing it.

The same way with reproof—there are good and bad ways; there are beneficial and harmful ways. Reproof is essentially an educational factor rather than an effort, which it sometimes seems, to release the emotional upsets of the person giving reproof.

As to the value of commendation, I can say unqualifiedly with respect to industrial personnel work that it is the typical situation that

when you do something wrong you get called down for it but when you do something right nothing is said. That is the typical executive relationship in industry in spite of the fact that everything we know about human nature leads to the conclusion that most people profit from, and get out of their shells and work hard on the basis of judicious, discreet, occasional commendation or approval from the big chief rather than on the basis of only being criticized when the thing is not going right. A judicious and far more generous use of commendation is one of the values that we can get.

Another matter of technique which giving thought to can improve is the getting and using of suggestions of those who are working with us. You will have to judge for yourselves whether this applies to you.

In short, by being lavish of his personal influence and thinking in terms of not merely getting the work done but of using the lubrication of mannerly, gentlemanly, considerate influence, the executive can go a long way toward becoming a leader.

Now, the other side ought to be mentioned. I would add to all I have said that the regular hierarchy of leaders can not do it all. There has to be the support of policy and practice and procedure of a personnel department, or whatever you may call it here. It takes care of the technical details of recruitment, classification, compensation, promotion, certain aspects of training and the like. If you are going to have a good organization, executives in charge of others should be supported by a specialized staff service of those who are particularly trained in the field of personnel. If you are going to have good leading and high morale, those two things are necessary—effective supervisory leading work on the one side and the supporting influence of personnel specialists and procedures on the other.

Let me add this: *Every* executive is the crucial personnel executive for the men and women in his or her department. The happiness of relationships and the effectiveness of work done in your department are not primarily or exclusively dependent upon what goes on in a personnel office as an agent for the department. The personnel work in its totality is as effective as *your relations with your subordinates are effective in good leading*. The difference, may I say, between a leading emphasis in directive work and bureaucracy comes right there. If one merely goes through the directive efforts and requires that the work procedures go on with no show of initiative, responsibility and leadership, these routine procedures soon create a deadening condition which we call bureaucracy. Where, however, department heads are able by virtue of their qualities to take more initiative, to be better leaders, to win loyalty, to point out the value of the goals being achieved—where all of those conditions are being satisfied—the danger of bureaucracy is going to be much reduced.

What then, in conclusion, have I been trying to say? First, that the leading emphasis, that the idea of leading, is a beneficial one for executives, for followers, for the effective conduct of work of organizations as a whole. The leading emphasis means evoking of positive motives and desires from those being led. It means the conscious effort on the part of the people who are doing the leading—effort of persuasive salesmanship as to what it is they are trying to do. It

means that the leader is clear about objectives and aims. It means that the rank and file do in fact as the days go on get a reasonable experience of growing, developing, being happy and satisfied, of making a contribution to the organized effort.

That, I think, is what it comes down to—the sense that you as a leader are building in those whose work you direct a genuine conviction that self-realization and self-satisfaction are being found by them in and through their job. If they are so being appealed to, the happy development of you yourselves as leaders will also be assured.

There is a brilliant challenge in directive work today to try to get this sense, this new grasp, this new exhilarating notion of how it is that workers and associates are inspired. Executives can elevate their work into something which is always challenging and interesting, because of the intricacies and changing diversities of human relationships. Wouldn't it be fine if all of us could exemplify in our supervisory work the beautiful lines from that old hymn:

We touch Him in life's throng and press
And we are whole again.

If the led can get, from time to time, that sense of *wholeness*, we have as leaders done a good job indeed!

* * *

PERSONNEL PROBLEM No. 2

Again our problem is based on an actual case, but a case that represents a type of case common to all organizations. This makes it a common problem worthy of common consideration. The answer is given in part in this lesson. Some elements of the problem will come up in future lessons, but this week we want to concentrate on it from one point of view. In this case, "supervisor" means the immediate superior by whatever official title he may be called. The case is this:

An employee had been getting along very well on a job and felt that he was a success.

Then for some reason the supervisor was changed. With the change in supervisors there was a change in policy.

Also there was something of the "new broom sweeps clean" effect felt at least by some of the employees.

Then there came reversals of long-standing policy. Things formerly considered good and worthy of commendation, now became poor and subject to supervisory criticism.

Then followed on the part of the employee first a feeling of disappointment, then disillusionment, sullenness, and finally bitterness.

Looked at either from the viewpoint of the employee, the supervisor, or the employer, it is an undesirable situation.

One solution would be to "fire" the employee. But that is unfair. He is a good man with a good record. Another would be to fire the supervisor. But this too is undesirable. He too is a good man with a good record. Either of these solutions would be evading the issue, not solving the question.

COMMENTS ON DISCUSSIONS

Problem No. 2

It is probable that many of the differences in answers are due to our different interpretations of the case and what it involves. It is, of course, impossible to give all the facts that have a bearing on the way a case should be handled. All we can do is to give some of the outstanding facts; then, in interpreting it, each of us will be apt to think of it in relation to some similar case we have known.

For example, in this case quite a number understood that the change in policy came down from an executive higher up and that the supervisor merely transmitted the order to the employee. Such cases do occur, and when they do, both supervisor and employee must recognize it, accept it as a part of the situation, like the weather, unless there is something that can be done about it.

For example, take promotions during the last two years. The order came down from Congress. Your supervisor could do nothing about it.

But this case is not like that. As I understood it the supervisor and employee were not in grades near the bottom but were near the top. Presidents and general managers deal with the same type of human reactions and need to observe the same guiding principles as do section chiefs and their employees. To illustrate this universal application of principles was one reason for the selection of this problem.

A few in answer to question seven thought the difficulty was due to "bossism," "domineering attitude," "lack of tact," or unintelligent supervision." As I understand the case, these things do not apply. Both very likely had had these rough corners worn off by experience and both probably recognized in a general way that the situation should govern, or that a policy should be adapted to the situation as it exists.

The trouble seems to have been that they were looking at the situation from different viewpoints and neither was seeing the situation as the other saw it, or probably was not seeing the entire situation at all. The "supervisor" from his new viewpoint saw things that the employee was not seeing or not giving sufficient weight. But to the supervisor they indicated a line of action which he thought ought to be clear to everyone; therefore he didn't bother to explain. The employee thought, possibly knew, that some important factors of the situation were being overlooked. What was needed was a careful analysis of the entire situation wherein all factors would be given consideration. Usually when this is done the employee and the supervisor can agree on what should be done. Where they can not agree, each will respect the other's point of view, and each will recognize that the responsible officer should make the decision.

An analytical study of the situation to determine what should be done in a given situation involves more than just a "frank discussion" or a "pooling of ideas." Frequently it involves tests and sometimes research. For example, the productive value of explaining the purpose of orders as against just orders has been tested many, many

times. In most cases, however, it is a relatively simple procedure to determine what the situation demands—that is, what should be done. In this case, since policy rather than method was involved, it is probable that the situation was complex, involving many intangibles.

While, as in one case handed me, a supervisor may tell an employee that he is not expected to think, in reality no supervisor wants you to take that literally. What he has in mind is probably the same thing Dryden was thinking of when he said, "How many never think who think they do!"

LECTURE III

NON-FINANCIAL INCENTIVES

By JOHN H. WILLIAMS

ALTHOUGH this course is conducted under the heading of "Personnel Administration," my talk is going to be very largely on management, which is closely akin to personnel administration but from a different angle. From the angle of how to get people to work effectively—how to develop the good-work attitude.

The usual method of stimulating effort is through financial rewards in the form of bonuses, profit-sharing, etc. These have proved very helpful, especially in productive industries, but by themselves they constitute a rather primitive form of management. To be fully effective, the work in connection with which they are to be paid should be carefully planned and so arranged as to furnish to the workers an opportunity for satisfying his or her pride.

Pride in one form or another is the mainspring of life, without it nothing is worth while. People may satisfy their pride in different ways. Some may even take pride in avoiding work, but those who work willingly do so either because they take pride in doing what is expected of them, or, because they are stimulated by the opportunity work offers for winning recognition among their friends and associates. People generally are more concerned about what their associates think of them than what their bosses think of them. A person may fool his boss, but he can not fool his associates. Whether he works in an office, a factory, or a ditch, he can not fool his fellow workers. This should be taken into consideration in planning work. It is with reference to how to plan work so it will stimulate the pride of the workers that I am going to talk to you today.

The best means I can think of to convey this to you is to tell you a true story of a case of this kind and then to discuss it, but before doing so I will enumerate the things that must be done so that you may identify them in the story.

The *first* thing you must do is to make a clear *definition of objectives in terms of the things desired to be accomplished*. People too often start to do something with the emphasis on what they are going to do rather than the ends which they wish to accomplish. Without a clear vision of what it is desired to accomplish, one is likely to do a lot of unnecessary things.

The *second* thing is to *group the workers according to the part they are to play in bringing about these accomplishments*. After you have made a clear definition of the things to be accomplished, then group the workers according to the part they are to play in bringing about these accomplishments.

The *third* thing is to *designate some one as leader and manager for each group*.

The *fourth* thing is to *determine a measure of accomplishment for each group*. There must be a measure. Merely an objective is not enough. It is too general. The translation of objectives into terms of measures of accomplishment is important in getting results. Without a measure one may mistake activity for accomplishment.

The *fifth* thing is to *make sure of a common understanding of the work and measures of accomplishment of each group by every other group*. It is not sufficient for the head of an organization and the manager of each group to know what is expected to be done. It also is desirable that each worker should know what his and every other group is expected to do. One way of driving home a definition is to say that it is *not* such and such a thing. Every group should know what every other group is to do, which is another way of saying what they are not to do, as well as what they are to do.

The *sixth* and last thing is to *establish a means whereby the accomplishment of each group will at all times be apparent to all other groups*. It is not sufficient that each group shall know what it accomplishes. It is desirable and helpful that the accomplishment of each group should be known to every other group. Did you ever see a child start to cry and then look around and seeing no one observe him, stop crying. Well it is much the same with grown people. There is not much to be gained by keeping records unless some one besides the persons directly involved sees them.

So much for the things that must be done to get the best results from a group of workers. Now for the story of an actual case.

The case I am going to speak of took place among a group of civil service workers within one of the departments of one of the states. This department handled complaints with reference to certain services of the government. There was great difficulty in having the complaints attended to promptly. There were from 10,000 to 15,000 such complaints yearly, and there were 1,200 to 1,800 complaints pending at all times. The situation was not satisfactory. It meant that a person making a complaint would have to wait a month or six weeks before the complaint was attended to.

The head of the department had tried very hard to shorten the time it took for a complaint to be attended to, but he had not been very successful. When he neglected his other work and devoted his time to complaints, he was able to get the pending complaints down to about 1,200, but when he turned back to his regular work the number of pending complaints soon rose to their former level of 1,500 to 1,800. He finally called in outside assistance in the matter and the problem was solved as follows:

A considerable number of complaints were studied to ascertain the work involved in satisfying them, and how this work could best be handled. There were found to be five kinds of complaints and it was decided to have five groups of workers and that each should handle only one kind of complaint. It having thus been decided how the complaints should be handled in general, the next step was to establish a regular routine for it and for keeping records with reference to it.

Accordingly, a central complaint desk was established to which all new complaints were to go and be recorded, and then passed on to the

appropriate group for attention. As and when each complaint was satisfied, it was to be returned to the central complaint desk. A different color was assigned to each group and when a new complaint was received at the central complaint desk the first thing done was to make for it two 3 x 5 inch index cards and a filing jacket of the color assigned to the group to which it was to be sent for satisfaction.

A visible index large enough to hold one 3 x 5 card for each pending complaint was placed in front of the central complaint desk, and one large enough to hold one 3 x 5 card for only one group was placed in front of each group manager's desk.

I assume you know what a visible index is. In the ordinary file you can not see what is on the cards unless you take the trouble to thumb through them. In a visible index file the cards are spread out on a panel. Each is 1/5 of an inch below the other, and you can read the first line of each card without so much as touching them. The approximate number of cards in a visible index file is apparent at a glance by the space the cards cover. If there are 40 cards, as the exposed space on each card is 1/5 of an inch, there would be 8 inches of cards. The central complaint desk file had to have at the outset 18 panels about 24 inches long, each holding 100 cards. Each group manager's desk file had to have from 3 to 5 of such panels according to the proportion of the whole number of complaints it would be required to handle.

The central complaint desk, after it had made two cards and a jacket for a complaint, put the correspondence and other papers, if any, pertaining to the complaint in the jacket and gave it, together with one of the cards, to the manager of the group according to its color. The group manager put his card in his visible index file and the central complaint desk manager put his in his visible index file. As each complaint was satisfied, the group manager took the corresponding card out of his visible index file and returned it with the appropriate jacket to the central complaint desk. The central complaint desk upon receiving such card and jacket took the corresponding card from his visible index file and filed both cards and the jacket in a satisfied complaint file.

Any one in any group could, by looking at the panel of any other group, see how it was doing. He could see if the number of cards in it was increasing or decreasing, and he could also see what was happening to the cards in his own group.

In addition to the foregoing a tri-monthly report was established which showed the following information in comparable form for each group:

- Cases pending last report
- Cases since received
- Footing
- Cases closed since last report
- Cases pending this report

A copy of this report was sent to the head of the department and to each of the five group managers.

The general procedure having been thus taken care of, and it having been decided that the work would be handled by five separate

groups, the work of each group was now studied with a view to defining its objectives in terms of things to be accomplished. This you will recall as the first of the six things necessary to be done to obtain the best results, described in the fore part of this talk.

This done, the next step was to group the workers according to their aptitude for the various forms of work to be done. This you will recognize as the second step.

The third step was to designate an individual as leader or group manager for each group. This you might very naturally think would have been done before the workers were assigned to the different groups, but it sometimes is desirable to see the size and character of the different groups before deciding who is to be responsible for them. Space was assigned to the different groups according to their requirements.

We were now ready to begin work under the new plan, but before doing so we needed to establish a measure of accomplishment. This you will recognize as the fourth step. In establishing this measure it was desirable that it should be the same for all groups, otherwise there would be no means of comparing the effectiveness of the different groups. After some thought it was decided to use the number of complaints dealt with. While all complaints did not require the same time and the complaints of some groups could on the average be handled more promptly than others, all of this had been taken into account in assigning the personnel to the different groups. While the number of complaints handled by the different groups was not comparable, the change from week to week in the number of pending complaints was.

At this point the person in charge of the complaint desk and the five group managers were called into conference. The whole plan was gone over and discussed at length. Each person was requested to study the plan in general and his part in it and to make such criticisms and suggestions as occurred to him. There were several meetings of this group. When there was a meeting of minds within it, each group manager called together his group and went through more or less the same procedure excepting that emphasis in the group meetings was upon understanding rather than suggestions, though the latter were given sympathetic consideration when offered. This corresponds to the fifth step.

The sixth step, as you will recall, was to devise and install a means whereby the accomplishment of each group would at all times be unavoidably apparent to all other groups. This had already been provided for through the visible index and the tri-monthly reports.

You very naturally will want to know the result of all of this. The result was a reduction in the number of pending complaints from between 1,200 and 1,800 to less than 400. This does not seem possible unless there was gross mismanagement under the former plan. This in a sense was the case. The department doing this work had grown up over a period of some twenty or thirty years. The work had been changed and increased by such administration, but it had never been reviewed as a whole and simplified and coordinated during all this time. As a natural result there was a great deal of unnecessary work and unavoidable confusion.

Under the new plan not only was the work in connection with each complaint greatly reduced through doing away with unnecessary records, but all confusion as to what was to be done with the different forms of complaints was done away with. There was no longer any need for discussion as to what could or should be done. But this alone would not have obtained the desired results. Making it possible to do something is only part of getting it done. The will to do and pride of accomplishment must be stimulated. This was done through the visible indexes over the group managers' desks and by the tri-monthly reports. No group manager could for long stand knowing the other group managers knew he was making a poor showing. Even less could he stand an associate asking how it happened the number of cards in his visible index had increased. He would, of course, always offer the excuse that the number of complaints had recently been more than usual, or that some of them had been troublesome, but he could not make this excuse indefinitely. In order to keep his standing among his associates, he simply had to keep up with the procession. The result, as stated, was a reduction in the pending complaints of from more than 1,200 to less than 400. This work was done over two years ago, and I was recently told that the pending complaints had never in this time risen above 400.

One thing in connection with this work that should be emphasized is the fact that the results obtained could not have been accomplished through any one or two of the foregoing features. It was the combined effect of all of them and their coordination that made them effective. People are apt to get a flash, an idea, to think of something and to make it effective without realizing its full implications. This is very apt to cause confusion rather than to simplify matters.

Our success in this work, however, as is often the case, created quite another problem. We were dealing with civil service employees and we found we did not have need for anything like so many as had formerly been used. We did not want to lay them off. But it seemed for a while as though there was nothing else to do. The complaints had always held the center of the stage and everything else had been sacrificed for them. When we started to look for work we soon found plenty of it.

For one thing, there was a very extensive filing system that had never worked satisfactorily. The fact is, the system, as a whole, had never been in use, and, naturally, that part that was in use did not work satisfactorily. You could never find anything when you wanted it. We fixed this up and did a lot of other things and so managed by improving and extending the service to keep the full force employed. But, from the standpoint of the complaint work alone, not only did we cut the average time required for the handling of a complaint from over a month to less than 10 days, but we reduced the number of employees on this work more than one-third.

This is a rather long and complicated story, but it shows how conditions can be improved through the use of non-financial incentives, and illustrates how and why they are effective. People are prone to think that financial incentives are effective of themselves—that no preparatory work is necessary to their effectiveness. But they are

mistaken. While a financial reward is of itself stimulating, it seldom produces a satisfactory result unless the work is carefully planned. I have always felt that part of the reason why financial incentives are effective is the fact that the establishing of a measure of accomplishment upon which to base a bonus entails at least some planning. Also, the amount of the bonus carried by the different workers constitutes a measure of accomplishment as between them.

One of the errors most often committed in trying to make an organization more effective is to go in for time and motion study at the outset. The reason I mention this is that I want to emphasize the need for starting with simple things. Time and motion studies are among the last things rather than the first to be taken up. The first things to do are those above described. Take each of the six items described, one by one, and see that it is taken care of, and get some simple system of this kind working before you attempt to go into refinements such as time and motion study. Make what you want to accomplish obvious, and establish a simple routine and you will find you will automatically get results. Give the employees an opportunity to feel pride in what they are doing and to match themselves one against the other. You will be surprised to see what this alone will accomplish.

The foregoing must not be taken as a model for all situations. Each situation is somewhat different and must be differently dealt with. It is given merely as an example of how one situation was handled and to illustrate how the procedure in that case was arrived at.

In doing work of this kind it is important that you should not become impatient with yourselves for not always seeing the best way at the outset or with the workers for not making an immediate response to your efforts. To get the best results you must keep eternally at it, but you must be willing to make haste slowly.

* * *

PERSONNEL PROBLEM No. 3

Out of the nearly 300 cases handed in I have selected four for your consideration. Everyone of the 300 are good, practical cases for consideration. Some indicate faulty supervision and others a decidedly wrong attitude on the part of employees. Neither a business enterprise nor a government department is run for the convenience and satisfaction of the employee. Each has an objective—something to be accomplished. The employees of either, both supervisor and supervised, should give the carrying out of this objective always first consideration. The welfare of the individual comes second. It is true, as has been stated, that the real leader tries to make employees enjoy their work, but the enjoyment is a means, not an end.

However, let the very best leader do the best he can, there will still remain some hard, disagreeable jobs that someone must do. And try as we will, it is not always possible to prove that the other fellow should do them.

The full solution of these problems has not yet been covered in our lectures. For the present we need consider them only in so far

as we have gone. First we had the value of leadership over command; next we had the development of the idea that "the situation gives the order." That is, if the supervisor and the supervised would each analyze the situation they would each come to the same conclusion as to what should be done. So the order does not in reality come from the boss; he merely expresses the need of the situation.

In our third lecture we had discussed some of the methods that help to make the work interesting. These are sometimes segregated into four groups. First, the financial incentive. It has its place, but its application in Government work is limited. Next comes craftsmanship. This means that the supervisor can take advantage of our instinctive pride in good workmanship to get us to do more and better work.

Third and most powerful of all is our "need for social respect." We all want to "be somebody" in our community and "amount to something." Then fourth comes loyalty. Not so much loyalty to the boss or the department as to the idea or objective—the thing the group or department is trying to put over.

Case I

What method is suggested of handling an employee, now in a minor (grade 2) clerical position in this department, who formerly held for years a supervisory position in another department, with complete charge of about 100 employees (but which position has been abolished), and who continually reminds everyone in the office of the important position she is accustomed to hold, thereby making herself very obnoxious to everyone in the office?

Case II

A girl I know started working at Grade 1, \$1,260, and a few months after her probation period (six months) was finished she was promoted to Grade 2, stenographer. This girl entered Government service about 5 years ago. For the past four years and a few months she has been working at \$1,440. She is always complaining because her bureau won't "give" her Grade 3 (CAF 3). She does nothing to improve herself in the way of education and yet she expects them to "give" her a raise.

Case III

On a certain work project, the supervisor divided his crew into two groups, a slow group and a fast one. The fast group did 800 units a day and the slow group 600. The pay in each group was exactly the same, yet the men considered it a privilege to be promoted from the slow group to the fast one and would do most anything to hold their place once having reached the fast group. Yet in reality all there was to it was a chance to do a third more work for no more pay. Why was it?

Case IV

A young man was employed as an accountant in a certain bureau of one of the government departments. He was classified as an accountant, and, as such, expected this particular kind of work.

Upon employment he was given clerical work, which was named audit of vouchers. There was some satisfaction gained by the young man for the first few months, but thereafter he became irritable and very dissatisfied and continued to be so for the entire year.

The type of person in the position of executive was one of the military type.

COMMENTS ON DISCUSSIONS

Problem No. 3

In our discussions of the cases given, there is considerable difference of opinion due largely to differences in interpretation. As I suggested in a previous lesson, when one is given such a meager factual basis, one tends to read into it other facts based on some similar situation that one has known. While your case may be similar as to the facts given, many of the contributory factors may be entirely different. So one of us will think the boss is to blame and the other the employee.

In reading over your replies at times I get confused. We have had two fine lectures on "leadership." Everyone seems to accept the idea that the "supervisor" should be a "leader." But there our agreement seems to end. Can one be a "leader" in the abstract or does one lead somewhere? And in a government bureau or in an industrial organization in what direction should he lead? What is his objective? If it is not toward more and better work, then what? What are we employed for? Every employee as well as every supervisor should be chiefly interested in the work, for, after all, that is the only excuse for any of us being here.

Another thing you should recognize is this: your first reaction to a case is apt to be an emotional one, but, after you have expressed your feelings, you will be better able to analyze the situation on the basis of its merits and arrive finally at a conclusion in which your reason, not your feelings, govern.

Without posing as an authority on the subject, it seems to me that I should have the same privilege that you have had and be allowed to comment on each of these cases. None of the cases are unusual, but any one of them may be difficult to handle. In considering them we must consider the total situation, not just the desires of the employee. One of the most important phases of the situation in many cases relates to limitations to the supervisors' ability to respond to demands. He has work to get done. It happens to be a certain kind of work, not just whatever someone wants to do, and, as to promotions, for two years they have been against the law in government work and almost unknown in industry. Then this thing of work—the supervisor does not have an unlimited number of all kinds of jobs to meet individual fancies. In the field service of our Bureau, in one unit we have a number of \$3,200 positions filled by men who a few

years ago were receiving five to ten thousand a year. Should they sulk around and lie down on the job until we have a \$10,000 job for each of them, or should they step in and give what they have to the job that exists and for the salary it pays?

Case I

As has been pointed out by scores of you, this would be a difficult case to handle. We all instinctively strive for social recognition. The employee has some very difficult readjustments to make; they would be difficult for any of us. The supervisor should recognize this and try to help. This can usually best be done by indirection and suggestion rather than by direct attack. Since the employee feels degraded, the problem is to develop a feeling of worthwhileness in the work being done. There is probably no chance to again put her in charge of a large group. So play up the opportunities and the importance of the present job. Ask her for suggestions and advice. Treat her as of value and get her to thinking about how to build up her present job. Remember that an important person can make any job important. And do not build up a false hope of advancement.

Case II

The situation governs and a part of the situation during the last two years has been an act of Congress. The supervisor very probably had no authority or opportunity to give her Grade 3. In such a situation some employees respond one way and one another. The supervisor should of course use all the devices so far discussed in our lectures to try to interest her in her work and to make her work interesting.

Case III

I was somewhat amazed at the differences of opinion on this case. Why it is a crime to make people enjoy doing more work instead of less, I fail to see. Likewise I am surprised that any of you should refuse to believe that anyone really prefers to do more instead of less. From my experience, I believe that the normal healthy individual likes to extend himself. It is the reverse attitude that is unnatural.

In this case the supervisor did a simple common-sense thing. He allowed the fast workers to work naturally and enjoy their work. The slower individuals were also happier because they also could work at a natural pace without being crowded and harassed by the boss or by their more capable fellow workers.

Case IV

In this case what reason is there to believe that the supervisor had at his disposal more important work or that the job was rated higher than it should be? The facts as stated are that a man was hired for a very important and necessary job, a vital part of any accounting office for which accountancy training is desirable, although not necessary. He did good work for a time and then became "irri-

table and dissatisfied." We do not know what the supervisor did or did not do. Nothing is stated as to his acts, only his type. The fault may have been with either the one or the other, but when a full-grown man accepts a position, takes the money and then sulks like a spoiled child for any reason whatsoever, he loses my sympathy. He exhibits a fundamentally undesirable characteristic. When this happens there is another obligation and responsibility of supervisors involved that has not yet been discussed. There is their obligation to prevent undesirable employees from obtaining permanent appointment. Dr. Feldman, in his report to Congress, says that the failure of supervisors to take proper action with unmeritorious probationers is the greatest weakness of the merit system.

LECTURE IV

TECHNIQUES OF SUPERVISION

By H. S. PERSON

MY SUBJECT today is really a unified combination of two distinct talks: Although one scheduled today is concerned with supervision of small groups, and the other next week with supervision of large groups, we cannot draw that distinction sharply insofar as the basic techniques are concerned. The principles of supervision that apply to a large enterprise apply basically to a small one. Details of technique may be somewhat different, but the principles expressed are not different, so that the distinction between the two will not be as great as the arrangement of your program would lead one to expect.

I can recall some survivals of the type of supervision employed seventy-five and fifty years ago, and predominant at that time. I have seen foremen swear at workers; I have even seen a foreman kick a worker. More recently on a visit to a plant I was invited to go with the officers and foremen about sixty or seventy miles to a coast resort for a couple of days' foremen's picnic. I asked why it was that they were taking all the executives and foremen, leaving no supervision in the plant. The answer was, "The plant can run itself all right." In this progressive, modern type of supervision there was such a momentum of good response from workers that supervision could be removed for a moderate period and the response go on just the same. There is a decided change from the supervision of seventy-five years ago to that of the more progressive plants today. I do not mean to imply that the earlier type has entirely disappeared, but as a dominant type it has. Nor is the modern type which I have cited generally dominant today, but it indicates the trend.

It is worth while to spend some time on the span between the typical foremanship of seventy-five years ago and that of today. If we consider supervision of the Civil War period, we find it chiefly concerned with factories. There were virtually no offices in those days—no large assemblies of clerical personnel. The conventional plant of the day was one in which the owner was manager and supervisor. Most of the work was bench work with simple machinery and apparatus. Most of it could be gotten into one room—brought under the general surveillance of the owner-manager, who had grown up from the bench himself. He sensed the whole job. There was a personal relationship between owner and manager, and foremanship was automatic.

The Civil War called into being engineering skills and capacities that had not existed before. These engineers began to design and build new and larger machines. Plants began to purchase and install these machines in response to larger markets made possible by building of

railroads into the middle and far-west. The plans became larger and division of labor developed rapidly.

Then arose a problem of supervision that had not existed before. All that an owner could do was to get some husky workman, with both physical and mental power, and assign to him the responsibility of supervising the other workers. No science of supervision was at hand. Supervision by foremen was a new venture; and that was the period that brought out the "boss." "Boss" is a typically American word. It does not exist in any other language with exactly the same significance. He was the one who told the workers what to do and when and how to do it—not always definitely or clearly. He left a lot of guessing to the worker, and he got his results largely by force of tongue and muscle.

That "boss" period had to give way because of inherent forces in the managerial situation. Following the period of the "boss" came the period of the "supervisor." It is the essential function and quality of the supervisor to be able to develop such a situation within the group that he can go off for two days on a picnic and the group go on working effectively just the same. Earlier the boss had to be present every minute. He had to be present every minute because he was everything in the situation; there was no organization, no pattern of response built up. So we have the early period of the owner-manager-supervisor all in one, then the period of the boss, and then the period of the supervisor—the period we are now in.

Now I desire to call attention to two or three things that happened in the latter part of the period of the boss. Because plants were growing larger and the problems of getting work done effectively and economically were becoming more complicated, the problem of finding people who could supervise was also becoming difficult and complicated. Managers were beginning to realize losses because of a lack of coordination. There was really considerable soldiering by workers. Some was wilful; but much was unconscious soldiering, not intended, the typical response of human beings to confused situations. Managers began to think about the problem of management and what we call the "management movement" developed. The very first thing which confronted managers was the problem of supervision, and in the 80's we find that the dominant subject of interest was wage systems. Differential wage systems came into vogue. There were many systems, among them the Halsey, Rowan, Towne—Halsey and other devices of differential wage payments. As I read between the lines, the motivation was to find something that would serve as a self-control by the workers—make them boss themselves. A differential wage system establishes a financial incentive to deliver what is wanted by the manager, even if the worker has to work too hard for his own good.

Each advocate of a differential wage system began to study the characteristics of his system in order to get points in favor of it. Out of this grew cost accounting, which became the second subject of dominant interest in this management movement. Cost accounting arose largely because each deviser of a wage system wanted to prove that his system was best, and he kept account of costs to prove how much was saved by his system. About the turn of the century, we find that

they had got so far in competitive comparison of differential wage systems that they began to discover that the wage system alone did not turn the trick. It was discovered that the managerial setting of the wage system was more important than the system itself.

Then they began to become interested in organization and methods, and the phases of management of dominant interest came to be "organization" and "system." One young man capitalized on this new interest and established a magazine called "System" about 1901 or 1902. All of this inquiry into differential wage systems, resulting in inquiries into costs, resulting in new forms of organization affecting results, had a profound influence on this problem of supervision. It accounts for the replacement of the boss by the supervisor.

Now let us look at some of the particular problems discovered in considering organization and system, and ways of doing things systematically.

In the first place, with increase in the size of markets and of factories, there was an increase in specialization and division of labor among and within plants. From the point of view of the worker, perspective began to disappear; he did not understand what was going on around him as did the earlier worker. When he lost perspective he lost understanding. He was less able understandingly to do the right thing at the right time. Then appeared the necessity for special provision for coordination; special principles and a special technique of supervision. It was discovered that there was involved: first, understanding by workers; second, proper facilities; and third, a proper emotional response.

I should like to say very clearly that my whole philosophy of management is one which assumes, because I believe it is true, that the attitude of the normal worker is to do a good job, and that where we find a worker not doing good work, the explanation is usually a bad managerial and supervisory situation.

How may we develop understanding among workers in this modern large or even small organization in which there is so much specialization and division of labor? The first way to get understanding to the worker is by some sort of explanation of the purpose for which he is there and for which the group is working. This purpose can be explained to him in several ways. In small enterprises it may be explained by informal conversations on the part of supervisors, supplemented perhaps by some simple manuals. The manual need not be elaborate. There may be more formal group talks in larger organizations. I know of enterprises which, just to help give workers understanding and restore their lost perspective, offers them organized trips through the plants similar to those conducted for visitors.

An authority on personnel management was asked to inspect a situation in a large plant. One of his most important recommendations was based on the fact that he discovered that the workers were losing interest because they did not understand what it was all about. He heard workers remark that "they provide guides for guests to go through this plant, but we have never seen it all, and do not know what it is all about." He recommended that the organization provide plant visits for their own workers on plant time. It was done and

made measurable difference in the attitude of workers—gave them understanding by restoring their perspective.

After explanation of general purpose to promote understanding, the second critical factor is definition of the duties of each particular individual. You cannot define duties by an offhand statement to a worker. Generally one can not in a casual way tell the worker what is to be done and have the worker understand with the desirable precision. There should be written instructions and organization charts, and the worker should have access to those parts pertaining to him and his relationship to the work. He should have not only a simple manual covering the entire purpose of the plant, but a very definite detailed section of the manual that pertains to his own location and relationships and responsibilities. Then, third, a definition of duties may come from that additional device identified by general term "standards," of which I shall speak more in detail.

This third thing that gives workers understanding, called standardization, involves a large measure of technique. Standards give the worker detailed information about how to do the tasks expected of him as completely and in as much detail as the management's information allows. These standards are numerous and it takes considerable time to formulate and classify them. They are of fundamental importance; they get into details of situations and duties. These standards may be classified as standards pertaining to apparatus, tools, machines and other equipment; materials that enter into each item of product; methods of performing operations; quantity of output desired, quality expected, and the reasonable time within which any operation should be performed. This requires analysis of product items, analysis of materials and analysis of operations—called job analysis. From these should result written specifications concerning the kind and quantity of materials required to make the product of each operation, quantity of items desired, the quality standards and tolerances, the most suitable machines, attachments and tools to use, and the best way of performing the operation.

You can call in from the street 20 or 25 young people who have never had any training or instructions in office work, set them down at a row of tables, and ask them to do almost the simplest work that can be done; and you may find a deviation from the average quantity of work turned out as great as 50 to 75 per cent. Then, if you study the work and make a job analysis, you will discover the best way to do it. Then you write out instructions and give them to the workers, and perhaps help their understanding by some manual demonstrations. You will be surprised in the result; the deviation may be brought within 5 to 10 per cent. You have given them understanding about methods of work and have not left that responsibility to them. The slowest worker will not have to be "bawled out" because he did not have the experience or the ingenuity to do as well as the fastest, or because he did not do it the best way, never having been told the best way. The combination of standards pertinent to any particular piece of work we call "specifications."

When I sat down to write out the outline notes which I am now following, to be typed, I not only took pains to indicate indentations

of my manuscript but I put between each line the figures 1, 2, or 3 with circles around them to indicate spacing, and when I was through I put on the copy "one original and one carbon." The little numbers in circles indicated the spacing I wanted for my particular eyes, and the notes concerning number of copies indicated exactly what I wanted. I got exactly what I wanted. On the other hand, the other day a piece of work was put through our office and I asked how many copies were being made. The reply was "I don't know." It turned out three were being made and that six were really needed. That required a new start at the typing—wasted work and irritated workers. There should have been positive notation on the manuscript concerning the number of copies wanted. I make it my own practice to put on the first page of a copy not only a statement as to the number of copies I want but also the stock on which I want it. I have in mind a recent report which we got out. First, the number of copies and stock on which it was to be typed were indicated—one original and so many carbons; original on regular stock, carbons on thin paper; pages so and so to be typed on canary colored paper, so that the conclusions and recommendations would stand out clearly. Accompanying it were specifications as to the margins; left, right, top margin and bottom margin. That work came out, although a half dozen girls worked on it, completely uniform. On all the stock in my private professional office, a colored line is printed inconspicuously near the lower left corner, so that the typist knows when she turns up that mark that the bottom line has been reached. Our typed manuscript always have uniform bottom margins. Every page is just the same. Those are devices for giving understanding.

We undertook in our office the coloring of maps to show the distribution of certain social characteristics. Before we knew it the coloring had been begun but with no logic in the selection of colors. They were just different. No one was responsible because no one had been given instructions. We worked out a standard whereby gradation of color in one direction from the middle of the spectrum meant different degrees of plus, and gradations in the other direction meant different degrees of minus. A glance at one of these maps makes an impressionistic reading easy: violets, indigos, blues for plus variations; green for neutral; yellows, oranges and reds for minus variations.

Speaking of agriculture, I remember seeing once complete specifications worked out by a nurseryman of the Forest Service which gave every specification for nursery work; planting seeds, cultivating, thinning, and then the transplanting; and the descriptions of devices for use in doing these things—a splendid piece of work. We should have something of that sort in all our work. You must have it in public works—dam and other engineering work. You should have that same degree of engineering in small groups of workers doing simple work. It makes such a difference in the responsiveness of the workers and the output.

Now a few words about facilities—proper apparatus, proper tools, proper flow of work and proper working conditions generally.

The late Wm. H. Leffingwell, a specialist in office management, told me over and over again of his experience in going into the general

offices of manufacturing plants and having them do this: He would have them get out a week's orders and compile the total time of the clerks handling those orders during that week, and, dividing the orders into the time, get the number of minutes required for handling an order, then would take several samples of each type of order and have one girl sit down and do all of the work necessary on those sample orders and divide the number of orders handled into her time. Invariably he discovered that she would do the work in, say, 40 minutes per order that the mass average showed required 400 or 500 minutes per order.

Inspection showed a lot of idle time when the work was done by the division of labor method, and inspection showed further that idle time was caused by these annoying wire baskets in which you put the work when you finish with it. It didn't get moved from one worker to the next promptly; it was held in a basket until it was full. He set up a messenger service system; a boy who went around continuously and picked up even one piece of paper in a basket and took it to the next person, so that the work was kept moving along. It reduced the average time for handling and everybody was happy about it; the costs of doing the work were reduced and the workers could be, and were, paid more.

I know of another case in the manufacture of small electrical parts like the coils in radio receivers, requiring a good deal of handling of fine wire and lots of fine soldering. Col. King Hathaway, when he inspected the conditions of management in that plant, discovered how great variation there was in the time required by different girls to make a coil. Some of the girls were trying to solder tiny parts with soldering-irons which were too large and heavy. That was like trying to cut a fine stitch with a big, blunt pair of shears. He arranged at each work-place a battery of soldering-irons of varying size, and then when a job order when through for the girl to make a hundred or a thousand particular coils, that order carried as part of the specification the number of the soldering-iron, as determined by experiment, which should be used. This arrangement made a great difference in the efficiency of workers; the burning of fingers, spoiled work, and irritations of other kinds.

The management must take care that the tools are the best for the purpose. It must take care of the conditions of work—heat, light, ventilation, nature of work desk and chair, and so on.

The question of workers' responsiveness is related to this matter of understanding and proper facilities. Mr. A. V. Hill, a distinguished English psychologist, has divided fatigue into three types: (1) The muscular fatigue which comes from intense muscular effort in a brief period, as lifting a heavy trunk from the sidewalk onto a truck; (2) the muscular fatigue that comes from very slight effort, but prolonged in time, as holding a book out at arms length for five minutes or so; and (3) emotional fatigue, the fatigue that comes from irritations.

Have you ever used the conventional community pen in the post office and said, "That makes me tired"? Have you ever said of your superior, "He makes me tired"? Have you ever said of a typewriter, "It makes me tired"? That reaction of irritation from something that

seems unsuitable or wrong—the pen or something else that does not work; somebody who has said an unkind thing to you—those things make one tired. That is a correct use of the English language because it generates the same sort of chemical reactions in the blood as do the muscular fatigues.

You can now see that the failure to give workers understanding and proper facilities causes failure in responsiveness, in part because of lack of understanding itself, and in part because of the emotional fatigue which is generated in them.

Unsuitable conditions and materials, unkind relationships, thoughtless relationships, unjust relationships, all of these generate an emotional fatigue which has a very great effect on the quantity and the quality of the output and on good will generally, sometimes generating ill will.

When once you get this sort of situation in a group, just because it is a group there is a certain contagion which makes it grow, and you get a multiplied effect on the output and quality of work.

In summarizing let us emphasize:

1. The necessity of giving each worker complete understanding of his total situation, of that particular situation in which he finds himself, and of detailed conditions of each task or job;

2. The necessity of giving each the proper facilities and an understanding of how to use them;

3. The necessity of avoiding all influences which tend to generate emotional fatigue—influences which are innumerable, but generally pertain to lack of understanding, unsuitable facilities and working conditions, and discourteous, unkind and unsympathetic relationships.

These things have to be adapted to particular managerial and supervision situations. You must take the principles and have originality enough to apply them to your particular situations.

* * *

PERSONNEL PROBLEM No. 4

Two cases have been selected from those handed in by the class and one borrowed from industry. This industrial problem was furnished us by Doctor Feldman, one of our lecturers. Your first reaction may be that government work is different and that therefore the case does not apply, but, after all, human nature is the same and the basic principles of leadership are the same in both classes of work. We thought possibly the outside case would be easier for us to view in a detached, unemotional manner.

Case I

A clerk failed to record a new symbol on several vouchers. The chief clerk over him "bawled him out" before the whole office force. It was not really the first-named clerk's fault, as he never had been given the circular instructing the use of this symbol. Strained relations developed leading later to an open break.

Case II

A has worked in a particular section for three years, knows his work well, but is very high tempered and has none of the qualities of

a good supervisor. When a supervisory position is opened B is appointed in charge of A. B has no experience in the work and is very lazy. A resents being under B's supervision and considerable friction develops. What is the division chief to do to smooth out differences and remove friction?

Case III

A well-known insurance company has recently completed three years of reorganization which has called to its attention sharply the relation between the capacities of the supervisors of certain of its sections and the efficiency of the working force of those sections. The company is now at the point of considering in what practical ways it can put this information to the best account.

This case provides so perfect an illustration of the matter under discussion that some readers may find it difficult to accept the situation as an actual one. Hence it may be well to state that the facts given below are entirely as related by an executive who has read and approved the statement, and that only minor changes, intended to make the identity of the concern less recognizable, have been introduced.

The home office of this company employs several thousand clerical workers. Of these approximately 1,000 are engaged in certain essential routine of issuing policies, taking care of lapses, revising old policies, and providing for transfers of policies. These 1,000 employees are practically all girls, subdivided into 22 sections, doing identical work.

By 1927, this whole group had been under uniform, consistent management of a high-grade male executive for almost two decades. According to the informant, every detail of the work had been completely studied to reduce unnecessary routine. Conditions had, as far as possible, been standardized, and production standards had been set. A continuous interest had been maintained in possibilities of improvement. The result was that the management had come to believe, and apparently with good reason, that further gains in these 22 sections were to be found not in further systemization from the top, but in certain intangible personnel factors which would promote more industrious and careful work by the employees concerned.

Early in 1927 a new plan providing for group incentives to the 22 sections was inaugurated. Briefly stated, the plan was as follows: First, costs of the various sections for the previous year, 1926, were carefully computed. Each section was then offered a group bonus of 50 per cent of the savings it could effect over the cost of that year as a base. All members of a section, including the supervisors, were to share in these savings monthly on the simple basis of salaries. The individual salary increases were to be administered as heretofore, in accordance with established company policies, and were to be unrelated to and unaffected by the group bonus offer. Therefore, the employees in any section had nothing to lose by the new plan, but could gain an additional increase in salary commensurate with their group showing. There was no competitive feature among the sections in the plan, the "bogey" being each section's own record for 1926.

At the end of 1927 every section had made some improvement. But there was a large spread in the results. The lowest saving was 2 per cent, the highest 12 per cent, and several were around a modal point of 8 per cent. When these results were published, the unfavorable comparison for many sections naturally led to discussion as to whether a more uniform high improvement could be obtained. There was much discussion because the section supervisors of the lower brackets had their own explanations of the situation.

These explanations by those with small savings in costs divided themselves into two kinds. One group of supervisors took the position that they already had such a near-perfect condition of morale and efficiency that very slight improvement could be expected, and that therefore the higher bonus earned by some other departments was an unjust reward for past inefficiency. This was the feeling also of many of the employees who suddenly found themselves at a disadvantage as compared with fellow workers in other sections who previously had been earning the same salaries. Another group of supervisors explained the disparity by a different line of reasoning. Their point of view was that there were inequalities among the sections responsible for the showing, such as difference of working conditions, a poorer grade of employees, etc. A supervisor would say: "Oh, yes, if I had Section X and its group I could have made just as good a showing or better. But Supervisor X should try a hand with the green hands and numbskulls in my department and we'd see how much of a bonus there would be."

Early in 1928, to meet these criticisms the management of this division shifted practically all the section heads to different sections, with the general aim of putting those who had been in charge of above-the-average bonus groups into those of less-than-the-average sections. The hope was to obtain a first demonstration as to whether differences in results were due to differences in management or differences in conditions. At the beginning of 1929, the range of progress was again compared. In this case the lowest saving was 6 per cent, the highest 18 per cent. Thus the range of difference from highest to lowest was only a little less, though the general plane of comparison had been raised. But the striking thing resulting from the listing was the fact that in progress made the order of the supervisors was practically the same. The previous leaders were still the leaders, the laggards were still the laggards, and the few changes in order involved were those in which two or three supervisors had moved relatively only a step or two.

However, the allegations of the supervisors not near the top continued as before, the assertions being that the changes made had benefited some supervisors and made the situation worse for the others. The old complaint recurred, "If supervisor Y had gotten my section, she would have had the worst," etc.

Early in 1929 the management met the situation a third time by shifting, practically by lot, 20 of the 22 supervisors. Although they were thus reassigned by chance, the listing at the end of the year again showed the surprising result that in progress made the same order of supervisors prevailed.

Further analysis revealed certain other significant facts. The most notable was in regard to the varying quantities of errors. A weighted record of these errors applied to the 1929 and 1930 earning records showed an absolutely perfect correlation between the standing of the accuracy record of the work under a supervisor and the standing on the earning record. This suggested that better quality as well as higher quantity was being obtained from the supervisors and groups earning the highest bonuses, and that if the results were a reflection of differences in capacity for leadership, accuracy was an important factor.

In the company, the records of these three years is now regarded by certain executives as proof that the differences in the costs—and therefore of efficiency—of these sections constituted difference in the level of executive leadership of the supervisors. The question therefore confronting them is how this conclusion may be used for the practical purposes of the concern.

COMMENTS ON DISCUSSIONS

Problem No. 4

The papers, and there were relatively few of them, have been read and graded and the grades recorded. In grading we refused to accept indefinite statements such as "stimulate interest," unless you told what you did to stimulate interest. And there were a lot of these generalities! Of course they mean something and in a way express things that need to be done, but as a supervisor on the job you don't just "create interest"; you do some definite thing for that purpose.

Another thing we had to guard against was the saying of the same thing in two ways. As for example, "He used wrong method of reprimand," and "Should not 'bawl him out' before others." Or, "He was high tempered" and "He lacked control of his emotions."

We tried to base our grading strictly on the lectures and accepted the following answers as right, although we did not require that they be stated just as we have stated them. If the meaning seemed to be the same or nearly so it was accepted.

Case I

1. He failed to see that the written instructions reached the worker.
2. He failed to check up to make sure that worker understood instructions.
3. He took action (bawling out) without knowing all the essential elements of the situation.
4. He gave public reprimand (there are cases where this is justified).
5. When discovered, he should have acknowledged his mistake.

Case II

- (a) 1. He was high tempered.
2. He let his emotions govern rather than the situation, in that he showed resentment toward B when B was not responsible.

* Problem four was considered as an examination.

3. He deliberately failed to work for the interests of the group because he personally did not get the promotion he wanted. His reaction to the situation was narrow and selfish. Loyalty to the job should come first.

(b) B in such a case should have discussed the situation with A, emphasized the fact that he did not select himself for the job, but that since it was done they should both make the best of it and work for the good of the group; also acknowledge A's superior workmanship and ask his help. He probably tried to ignore A's situation, but it had to come out, and being suppressed caused it to get worse instead of better.

Case III

This case was very carefully worded to eliminate all mechanical factors, in fact everything but the supervisor. Therefore the things that Dr. Person emphasized most—analyzing job to eliminate waste efforts, definite instructions, definite routines, etc.—had already been done. The problem said “every detail of the work had been completely studied.” So the things one would ordinarily do first in a case of low efficiency were ruled out in this case. Also financial incentives were ruled out as they had already been supplied and were satisfactory. There remained then, only those little things that one does to make it easier and more interesting to work together as a group. Dr. Williams emphasized some of these things. Dr. Person also mentioned them.

1. A group objective definitely known and understood. The objective in this case was to beat the old low record, be recognized as a “high” group and incidentally get the bonus.

2. Discuss objective with group and plan with them—ask their cooperation. Make it a *group affair*.

3. Have an understandable *measure* of accomplishment as it applies to each so that the ones either holding back or boosting up the group record can be recognized by the workers.

4. Post the *record* daily or weekly as compared with the old “poor” record.

5. Do not “crowd” or “threaten” the slow ones or encourage others to do so, but discuss their troubles with them and try to help out.

6. Make beating the old record a “game.”

7. Do not emphasize the bonus that comes from winning. Too much emphasis of a purely selfish motive is apt to provoke dissensions between the fast and the slow, and thus slow up the whole group.

There are many other things that might be done, and some very good suggestions were made, but any three of these seven were accepted and given “OK” rating, providing the underlined ideas were brought out in some way.

LECTURE V

TECHNIQUES OF SUPERVISION (Continued)

By H. S. PERSON

THE principal points I made in the talk concerning supervision of small groups were that proper supervision and proper personnel work should be aimed to (1) bring about perfect understanding on the part of all workers and supervisors, on the part of all the co-operators in an enterprise; (2) see that adequate facilities of all kinds are available from the most minute apparatus to the largest machines with which this understanding may work; (3) develop such a situation that there is not present in the cooperating group what I called at the last hour "emotional fatigue"; and (4) develop and maintain what John Commons in a very excellent book written about fifteen years ago called "industrial good will." The same principles apply to the supervision of large groups.

Although the principles of supervision and personnel work are identical for both the small group and the large group, and although most of the devices that are employed in conducting personnel work are essentially identical, nevertheless, this matter of size does present certain special opportunities to the large organization. The small enterprise has perhaps all the functions that the large enterprise has, and they all have to be attended to; yet they may be so squeezed into each other, so to speak, so overlapping, that they are not discernible in a small enterprise. In the large enterprise sheer size brings functions out into perspective so that each is discernible and can be provided for; things can be done in terms of separate functions and separate responsibilities. It is an interesting historic fact that the most advanced ideas concerning supervision and personnel work and the most advanced methods have been developed in the large enterprises rather than in the small ones; it is the small ones that have learned from the large ones. That is because the various functions and responsibilities—things to be done—are observable and separately measurable in a large group, and methods of supervision and personnel work developed accordingly. These developments have come to the attention of the managers of small groups and they have been able to adapt them to their particular circumstances.

There is another thing that is practicable for the large group organization; that is specialization and functionalization of this very matter of supervision. In the small group the operating executives themselves generally must be the personnel executives, whereas in the large enterprise size enables it to carry what would be an intolerable overhead for small organizations—specialized methods and personnel directors. This functionalization and specialization of personnel work and making it the responsibility of a single competent individual and

staff enables the large organization to do a great many things that the small one cannot do, even if in principle they are identical.

The large organization is not so complicated as one may at first assume. You may have assumed that the direction of personnel in a large organization is many times as complicated as in a small enterprise, but that is not necessarily so. There are planes of planning and executing personal policies and methods, just as there are planes of planning and executing operations. Let us consider, for instance, a great corporation of the size of General Electric or General Motors. On the highest plane there is what I call *directive planning* of personnel policy. Those responsible for this general direction of policy may be located in the central office of the holding company, and think in terms of the entire enterprise and of whole plants as units. They make plans, work out specifications, budgets, schedules, and plans of action in terms of each entire plant as a unit. They are not concerned with departments or individual workers. They direct and coordinate labor policies of the entire enterprise and of the constituent operating companies, but not of departments and work places.

The next plane of supervision and personnel work is what I have called in some of my writings the plane of *general administrative* planning and execution of personnel work. This is accomplished in the general office of each of the individual plants. The personnel manager of the constituent plant receives from the directive plane statements of policy, budgets, etc., in respect of labor management. This plant personnel manager applies these budgets and schedules and principles of labor management to the problems of the particular plant, and he thinks in terms of the individual departments of the plant. He is not concerned with the individual work places of the plant.

The third plane is that of *detailed execution* of policies in terms of the problems of relations with individual workers at individual work places. Here are applied details of policies and methods which are consistent with general policies and fit the general frame of procedure, yet are adapted to the particular circumstances presented by differences among workers and jobs.

Thus in a large plant it is usual to break down this great mass of related activities into what we may call logical planes, and to define responsibilities for each of these planes in such wise that there is not too heavy a responsibility beyond the capacity of any management, at any one point. The principles, the devices, the methods at the unit work places are the immediate concern of a foreman or supervisor but they are coordinated throughout the enterprise because they are derived from general instructions received from the general administrative plane.

An apparently complicated whole is thus resolved into a group of related relatively simple situations. Take for example Pennsylvania Railway Station in New York City—it appears to be such a complicated thing that one marvels that trains don't bump into each other, injuring people and destroying property. Hundreds of trains are handled there, day in and day out, year in and year out, without anything going wrong. One wonders how any human mind can keep track of all the details. One human mind does not do it. Those

that are concerned with one sector of responsibility are concerned only with that sector, and that sector dovetails into others because all have been conceived and laid out by a master mind and everything is coordinated. If each attends to his little area of responsibility correctly, the whole proceeds harmoniously and correctly.

So it is in this matter of personnel work. In each sector of a large enterprise are applied the same general principles as are applied in the well-managed small enterprise; development of understanding, provision of proper facilities, elimination of everything that would cause emotional fatigue, and development of good will. The principles and the basic devices are the same. Manuals, general orders, special orders, instructions, and so on are the same in the large plant as in the small plant.

The great difference is the fact that in the large group there can be functionalization and specialization, and it can do some things that are too costly for the small enterprise. It can have specialists for functional posts of personnel work as well as for separate areas. It can have a unit that is concerned especially with the matter of selection of workers. In the better-managed large plants selection is very thoroughly studied and highly developed. The oldest basis for selection have been records of past performance—general, not specific—a very broad record of past experience. The more modern of the applications that have to be filled will require that this record be considerably more detailed. It will ask the applicant to describe the types of machines he has operated and the type of products he has made. That is getting down to selection on the basis of skill, as far as records can show.

The next thing that came into the picture to supplement selection on the basis of records was tests—intelligence tests and trade tests of various kinds. I suppose it was the extraordinarily interesting work that was done during the war in the testing and classification of personnel, where for the first time the scientists in this field were able to get a huge laboratory for the purpose, that led industry immediately afterward to pay attention to this matter of intelligence and trade tests. The first enthusiasm has not entirely survived, and they are now used more rationally. The trade tests, on the whole, have worn well because they are specific tests of skill. The general intelligence tests have not worn so well, simply because it was assumed that at the beginning they would throw a great deal of light on the capacity of the individual, whereas they threw light on the average of a mass who were tested rather than on the individual. But a plant that selects its workers on the basis of general intelligence tests will get more alert and able people out of every 100 applicants than a plant that does not. Intelligence tests are still used, but without the enthusiasm and entire dependence upon them that was placed on them some time back.

One of the more recent devices for selection that is receiving a great deal of attention—provided there are those who are skillful enough to use it—is the personal interview. Not the old-fashioned type of hurried interview, but the interview by an expert who by hidden relations between questions asked will bring out the inner and

emotional characteristics of the applicant at the very time the applicant thinks he is talking about such commonplace things as skill and experience.

This matter of susceptibility to emotional fatigue is one of the most important matters to which attention should be given in selection.

In large enterprises the matter of training can be specialized under general supervision of functionalized personnel managers. The early type was the training which resulted from putting an apprenticed hand beside an older worker and having him observe and ask questions and get what he could out of the older worker. This sort of training is bound to build up in the course of time great variability of methods and skills among workers. In a large enterprise that wants workers to work together to secure uniformity in accordance with the best methods, there will be instruction courses of one sort or another—even organized instruction that might well go under the name of a school. Many manufacturing plants have what we call a vestibule school in which the new workers are taught specific operations of the plant in a wing or "L" of the main part of the plant where the older workers are at work; and as fast as the performance records of the new workers show that they have acquired a capacity to be absorbed into the main body of workers, they are passed from the vestibule into the main room, and go right on with the same sort of work they have been doing. A good many concerns are developing the practice of taking workers through the plant and orienting them with respect to the entire environment in which they are working; giving them some picture of the part that is played in the entire project by the small cogwheel which each of them represents.

Another method of training workers is that of actually scheduling them through the various departments; having them work three weeks or a month or six weeks in each department before they are finally selected for the operations of a specific department. On the whole, it is one of the best methods of training. This all-round training is then supplemented by special training in the department in which the particular individual is to work.

After training comes the specific assignment. With such selection and such methods of training as I have just been talking about, it is then quite possible to assign workers to specific departments or specific operations or specific specialties with some reasonable basis of fitness—the round pegs in the round holes and the square pegs on the square holes.

Following assignment comes the matter of personnel relations, or the relations growing out of general supervision of the worker, now a full-fledged worker fitted to his work.

Now comes the joint responsibility of the foreman in immediate charge of the work and of the personnel department to bring about definitely understanding of the work being done at a specific point and of its relations to the whole. Both foreman and personnel department should cooperate to bring about all the conditions of work that make for efficiency and agreeableness—to see that there is good management and a proper flow of the work to the workers; to see that there

are the proper tools of all kinds for the workers to have; to see that the personal relations between the supervisors and the workers are the relations between cooperative human beings and not between the old-fashioned boss and the dispirited worker; to see that all the standards of tasks and of results are specified, measured, and are open and above board; and generally to see that the management itself is a smooth-running management that is effective and yet not conspicuous.

One of the leading French engineers once said that the French workman, like the French soldier, likes to obey but does not like to be ordered. That applies to the American workman and to the American soldier also. Workers like order, but do not like to be ordered; they like to obey but do not like to be told to obey. That is, they do not like the old-fashioned foreman or any of his survivors who is all the time giving orders or making criticisms; who does not lay out work with precise specifications and then leave execution to the workers; who leaves the workers to do a great deal of guessing, and then comes around and damn them for not being able to guess correctly just what was in his, the foreman's, mind.

Finally, there is the matter of development of individuality and also, recognition of individual capacity. One comes from giving precise instructions and then putting the worker on his own responsibility; the other comes from keeping records of performance. I think that the keeping of performance records is one of the most important aspects of the whole situation. Mr. Taylor used to say that work should be a game. There is something in that. If proper records of skill and achievement are kept, workers generally are enabled to know in what respect they measure up to the requirements of their responsibilities. Modern psychology has discovered that differences among individuals is a fundamental trait of human nature, and honest measurement of differences is respected by workers and gives them confidence in the management.

Assuming that workers of an organization have been at work at desks, benches and machines, and the organization has become a going concern, then arises the question of promotion. I am sorry to say that the small enterprise is not likely to have any particular standards of promotion, whereas the large enterprise, because it is able to functionalize this work of direction and supervision of personnel, may have a committee concerned particularly with the matter of promotion. This committee may work out, in the first place, definite channels of promotion from certain types of work to other types of work in an effort to establish a picture in the mind of the worker as to just what possibilities of promotion lie ahead of him. The well-managed enterprise will try to secure promotion for workers. One of the best managers I ever knew said he always felt happy when some of his workers, some of his supervisors and superintendents, were called away by another firm. He said he liked to "graduate them through the roof." He liked the idea of having a definite, automatic method of promotion throughout his plant. This manager educated workers and supervisors so that they could give all there was in them. He felt that the gain from the spirit of the thing more than compensated for the workers

who were lost to better positions elsewhere. However, that is not generally the attitude of employers.

Mr. Gilbreth devised what he called the three-point system of promotion. Every executive, every supervisor, every worker, should be the understudy of someone higher and should have an understudy to himself. This makes no one indispensable, but, on the other hand, no one would be prevented from promotion because there was no one fitted to fill his place. Mr. Gilbreth used to organize this three-point system of promotion so that the workers in the establishment could see definite channels and learn what was required in order to pass along through these definite channels. The idea was that every worker, every supervisor, every executive had to have his understudy, who did part of his superior's work so he could learn it.

The large enterprise, being able to support the functionalized personnel department, is able to make special study of the matter of remuneration. There has developed in the study of this subject during the last thirty or forty years two basic contrasting modes of payment; the time system whereby one is paid for an hour's work, a day's work, a week's work, regardless of output; and the piece-rate system whereby one is paid for unit output no matter what the time taken. Then there are various intermediate or composite types of payment that have characteristics of the two basic modes; as, for instance, the task and bonus system of payment, which is considered among industrialists as probably the best, in which a worker is paid a day's wage for a day's work, but a bonus on top of that if he will turn out a certain standard, predetermined amount of work per unit of time; and those standards are not set beyond achievement. The purpose of this system is to assure the worker a basic wage no matter what happens, and also to stimulate all workers to work not at the limit of physical capacity but at that reasonable best which has been determined by experiment as suited to bring about a uniformity of production that permits of very considerable economies generally because it permits precision in planning, calculations of costs, and determinations of delivery dates.

There has been a trend of late—and this is characteristic particularly of the types of enterprise that represent office work, as in some of the big insurance companies, and in such work as the making of clothing and other needlework—there has been a trend toward getting some of the essential characteristics of the piece-rate method of wage payment under the form of the time-rate method of wage payment. This is done by dividing the work into two classes and having a time-rate for each class of work. The specification for a class of work will include not only specifications of the technical nature of the work, but specifications of output per unit of time, and the maintenance of a certain quality, in order that the worker shall be included within the class. This problem of financial and other incentives is sufficient for a course of lectures.

We have got now perhaps to that phase of relationship with the worker which follows the continuity of his work; that is the subject of lay-off and discharge. Of course, in our present society, industrial enterprises and commercial enterprises cannot avoid lay-off and dis-

charge. Since our system is what it is, and as long as we expect them to put everybody possible to work when there is work to be done, generally it is felt that we cannot expect them to hold workers when business is not good. It is one of the defects of our present economic system, but as long as we are operating in accordance with the general characteristics of that economic system, we have to face this matter of lay-off and discharge. Fortunately, it does not affect institutions like that to which those whom I am talking to today belong.

This brings up, on the one hand, the matter of equitable selection in designating those who are to be laid off. The first impulse is of course to lay off the least efficient workers, and this is generally the practice. But some enterprises that are exceptionally well managed by owners possessed of humanitarian traits, modify selection for discharge on the basis of efficiency by considering personal circumstances—whether there is a family to support, children at school, and so on. On the other hand, it brings up the question whether a firm is, in the long run, well managed if it has great variations in employment except under the special circumstances of a general debacle such as that from which the world is suffering today. May not that enterprise be the best managed which schedules a lengthened program of production or other service, resists the temptation of building up the force in response to a temporary boom, another resists the temptation to diminish its force in a temporary decline of business?

With respect to debacles such as that from which we now suffer, a bill is before the Congress designed to make this a collective responsibility; designed to build up reserve disbursement to unemployed, thereby maintaining consumer demand and perhaps stimulating business and reemployment. The success of such efforts is problematical.

All through this relationship, from selection and training and assignment to possible discharge and lay-off, there must be such supervision as to obviate emotional fatigue—the fatigue which causes the worker to say, “It makes me tired,” or “This company makes me tired,” or “He makes me tired.” That can come about only by the development of good management and of the most human, gentlemanly, courteous relations between workers and supervisors.

One of our national problems is, just how we are going to develop our public institutions so that they show high qualities of personnel management comparable to the best in private industry. Competition has forced it in the latter, but not in the public institutions. It is a problem to which every supervisor among you should give his personal attention and concern. There should be more planning and pre-determination of work, more standards so that performance may be measured and individual distinctions revealed, and more definite channels of promotion in terms of personal distinctions. There should be more planning, less casual action in terms of the accidental. It is a large problem for democracy, and I am glad to know that studies are being made which look towards improvement in the situation.

* * *

PERSONNEL PROBLEM, NO. 5

For our lesson this time, I am going to try a different plan. Instead of giving four cases and asking you to brief your replies to an

extent that inhibits normal methods of expression, I am including only one case and will allow you one full page. The case is not exactly what I would like to have to go with the lecture, but still it is a pretty good case. I won't say it is typical for the Department of Agriculture. However, I do not know all that goes on in the department. It may be our case.

The case involves three people: a stenographer, a "boss," and a chief clerk. Instead of doing as we have in the past, and saying that the boss should have done so and so, let us try to analyze the acts of the three individuals and determine as well as we can why they reacted as they did. Of course, the whole story is not there, and we shall each add details according to our experience and observations. We should determine reactions or actions and their causes as well as we can from past lessons.

Why did the boss, for example, want a stenographer when he did not have work for one? And why did not the chief clerk take action when he found that time of an employee was being wasted? Follow through on all acts and try to analyze them. The reason for doing this is that, after determining why, we are in a better position to determine what is needed to change any undesirable condition response. Possibly some of you will read in "Psychology for Executives," Chapter 1, on "Why men are what they are." The other references are not closely related to the problem.

The Case

A young lady, an excellent stenographer and bookkeeper with several years' experience, resigned from a fairly good position as secretary to a district manager of a commercial firm in order to accept a position in Washington as clerk-stenographer with a certain department, confident of her ability to perform the work satisfactorily and win promotion in due time. Unfortunately, she was assigned to an office in which there was practically no work (about 1½ to 2 hours per day—and she had been accustomed to working hard from 8:30 to 5), with an average of about one letter per day being the extent of the stenographic work. Naturally, sitting around with nothing to do, most of the day quickly grew monotonous. Every time she requested the chief clerk (having already mentioned it to her "boss" several times) to transfer her to another office where she might have more to do, her "boss" would object on the basis that the office rated a stenographer and that he was going to have everything that was coming to him, and refused, accordingly, to O.K. the transfer, and the chief clerk, being an easy-going sort of man, would drop the matter.

This ran along for several months until finally a very tense situation developed and one day some very pointed remarks were made to each other by these three, with the result that the girl was detailed (not transferred) to the fileroom, on account of the antagonism which developed from the remarks, and assigned to indexing. No doubt her record will be marked unfavorably.

COMMENTS ON DISCUSSIONS

Problem No. 5

Your discussions of Problem 5 have been exceptionally fine. It seems to me that there has been a very noticeable change in attitude toward these cases I have been giving you. In the beginning, while we all professed to believe in leadership, yet in the solution of cases we almost invariably fell back on authority; we would go over the boss's head to a bigger boss. Now we seem to realize that most of these cases can be integrated. That through a study of the situation we can usually find a way to get the desirable things without hurting the work or any individual.

In this particular case almost everyone realized that it was not necessary to accuse anyone of undesirable motives or willfully wrong actions. The situation developed—and none of its factors are at all uncommon—because of a lack of training. Not any one of the three had been specifically trained to meet situations of that kind. In the work for which each had been trained, it seems probable that each was an efficient worker.

The boss is probably a scientist assigned to a project, although he may be in any other line. It never occurred to him that the new stenographer would need training—need to learn about his project, his work, or how she was supposed to help. He just took for granted that stenographers were stenographers and knew instinctively what ought to be done. Had he had training in advance for his executive work he would have known how to handle such situations as this and others, and it would have been a big help to him in handling his project. A boss needs training as a boss. We do not know “bossing” without learning any more than we know chemistry without learning.

Likewise, the stenographer was a fine type and efficient in so far as her training had prepared her, but, when placed in a new situation where general secretarial help rather than stenographic proficiency was needed, she didn't know what to do. That was not her fault. Next time she will know better, but her training has been unnecessarily harsh. Experience is a slow and expensive teacher.

The chief clerk likewise was the product of his training. The “hands off” attitude he displayed is common in industry as well as in government. It results from division of labor, where the “division” is emphasized more than cooperativeness. It won't do for any of us to interfere with another's work, yet frequently we have opportunities to help without interfering. Had the chief clerk been properly trained, he could have been a big help to both the others without either feeling that he was interfering or using or usurping authority. There are any number of better ways than the one chosen by the three participants, yet each was doing what he thought was best. Right methods come from proper training.

What I have said here is merely a résumé of what was said over and over again in your papers; not all in any one paper, but something of it in each. A great many took pretty much this point of view.

LECTURE VII

TRAINING

By W. J. DONALD

MY SUBJECT today is training. While the subheads are introduction to the job preliminary training, and training on the job, I have so little sympathy for vestibule school training, or classroom training, even of the kind we have in our colleges and universities, that I am going to devote most of my discussion to training on the job. I should like to state that nowhere else in the academic world are sound principles of pedagogy violated so much as in our university teaching and that no other class of teachers is so completely immune to training in methods of teaching and training, as the professor who, presumably knowing all things in his field, need not know anything of the process of teaching and training.

There are some essential requirements to any training program. The first is an incentive to learn. It must be strong. The second is that the need for instruction and training must be rather clearly apparent. The third is that the learning process should be such that it is possible to carry it on from, first, the appearance of a job difficulty which creates the need and recognition of the need of training to a tried activity—that is, one actually does something that is carried through finally to an activity that is tested and proven workable. Just at that point we must keep firmly fixed in our minds that there is no such thing as training without the creation of right habits of action. The passive absorption of information and ideas does not constitute training at all. It may be education of a sort, but it does not constitute, in my mind, training.

Now in occupational training, before you can do an effective job, it seems to me you must first have a definition of objectives. That is a phrase I have added to my own thinking regarding management, whether it be in governmental affairs or in business—the *concept of objectives*. A lack of clear-cut, understandable, and preferably written objectives is the root of failure to accomplish results. Years ago I tried to write my first book. I had the greatest difficulty in writing that book until I had decided whether that book was going to be on the economic history of a particular industry, or on the tariff as it affected that industry. As long as I had two conflicting objectives I was in a muddle, and my professor also had his trials and tribulations, because he did not know where I was going and was also in a state of confusion. So, an essential to any training problem is a clear-cut definition of objectives. We need it in government before we can set up anything like a program. We need it in industry, and we need it, much more than we have had it in the past, in our educational institutions. If there is any one thing that I should like to emphasize more

than another, it is the importance of incorporating the concept of objectives in our thinking about any problem, if we are to make the progress we should in its solution.

The second thing, it seems to me, we need before beginning any training program, is to *establish policies for attaining objectives*. In the last few years, I think more particularly since the depression began, the concept of *policies* has taken hold in the management world. The time was when we were content with technique and procedures. We were inclined to elevate them to a rank of great importance, but as we have been forced to think closely about business problems we have been compelled to classify, define, and more and more put in writing approved policies which are essential for the attainment of the objectives which, presumably, we have previously defined. In business, of course, for the most part, the objective of profit is about as far as most people get. I am not so certain that such satisfies today's longings and human needs, but for most people that is still the sole objective in business, so far as their thinking is concerned. In a governmental project, such as many of you are identified with, I think it is possible to define objectives in a more comprehensive way because there is no domination of some particular overwhelming objective. The establishment of policies and their classification for the attainment of objectives, seem to me to be the essential prerequisites of good organization.

The next thing before you can get on with a training program is that *you must establish a sound organization*. My hobby, in recent years, in my thinking about business and governmental problems—because I spent a great deal of my early years in the field of government—has been, frankly and with no apologies, organization theory. I say theory without any apologies, theory as an interpretation of sound organization. After all, there is no such thing as theory that is not a sound interpretation of some realm of human experience. What does a set-up for sound organization require? First, analysis of the job, what is to be done in order to carry out these policies, in order to attain objectives; second, a definition of requirements for carrying out these jobs, man requirements, what kind of qualifications are needed to carry out the job; third, classification of these jobs based on the man requirements; finally, an evaluation of the job in terms of importance and, ordinarily, the economic value.

Then, having made your analysis of jobs in these terms, it becomes essential to *define responsibilities*. In business perhaps and *sometimes*, I fear, in government—we see evidences in the newspapers occasionally—great difficulties accrue because of failure to define responsibilities, and it is generally true that responsibilities are not defined. Worse still, they are not allocated definitely. There are two general theories of organization, one of which we find quite conspicuous in some lines of government and business. Under this theory, it is held that the specialist should have the function of control over those who perform an operating job—not those who are immediately under his supervision, but those out where they are doing the operating job. Consequently, an elaborate system of checks and balances is set up in which the specialist assumes power and has power and responsibilities

which weaken the whole operating or line organization. I think I could find, for instance, in Washington today an arm of the government which is probably the most amazing example of checks and balances, and therefore of bad organization—buck passing and what not—that has ever existed. It seems to me in contrast that good organization (which is fundamental to any training program), requires clear-cut, definitely allocated responsibilities, with the elimination of division of responsibilities and the placing of specialists, with special technical knowledge, in an advisory capacity only rather than in a position where they share responsibility with the line or operating officials. Moreover, I believe it essential for good organization to establish a complete understanding by the organization of the relationships that obtain or should obtain between people holding different executive or supervisory positions. It is not enough to define responsibilities and to allocate them definitely. It is quite as important that those responsibilities together with the relationships between different classes of executives and supervisors, should be clearly understood.

One of the next things that is necessary in a sound organization is *decentralization of responsibility*. In a vast far-flung organization decentralized responsibility with full powers must be placed out in the field at the scene of action. Failure to decentralize and locate adequate responsibility at the point of action is one of the great difficulties in many business organizations. Organizations which have made proper arrangements for decentralization of responsibility are those which have forged ahead in the last couple of decades and more than others held their position during the severe period of depression.

It is necessary, of course, in business as in any organization, especially when it gets to be any size, to establish a staff of what I call facilitating departments or services to help the line or operating organization.

It doubtless is too much to expect that all of us can be experts on budgets; that we can be experts in personnel; that we can be experts in accounting; that we can be experts in, say, office management; that we can be experts in publicity, and so on. But what can be done in our organizations, whether in business or in government, is to provide those experts or facilitating services to help us set up standards for which we are responsible; who can, from time to time, measure our results; who can advise us, strengthen us, and train us in regard to their own particular fields of knowledge.

I have repeatedly taken the position that what American business needs is more all-round business men rather than experts. What I mean is, that, with this process of definitely allocating responsibility, especially for the function of command, and with decentralized responsibilities making every supervisor a sort of general manager in his field—a whole hierarchy of general managers from the president on down—we need more all-round managers who have the capacity to be accountants, supervisors, personnel men, budget men, and who, with a reasonably high degree of competency, can perform all of the functions that the manager of the small business has to perform.

Another sound principle of organization especially is the *provision of proper compensation or incentive*. That, of course, may consist,

particularly in the government service, of setting up of understood lines of promotion and encouraging advancement, as well as preparing an adequate salary plan.

Another principle of organization is the *careful selection of personnel*. I shall not place much emphasis on that. What we know today about the careful selection of personnel is relatively little compared with what good training promises us.

We must, of course, establish procedures that will make it possible for an organization and its personnel, economically to execute policies in order to obtain our objectives. But, doubtless, that comes last in logical sequence. Our subject today is training. Assuming that you have set up clean-cut objectives and the policies required to attain those objectives, the proper organization to execute these policies, and a set of procedures to simplify that process, then you are prepared for a program of training people on real problems, on the job, through the operating organization consisting of the supervisory force.

I want to say something now about training on the job versus classroom training and this is going to be a reflection on what I am trying to do here today. All apprentice training in early economic days was done on the job, by the master craftsman, the experienced and skilled artisan who was owner, workman, merchant, and who combined the whole economic process of production and selling in himself. That method of training obtained in our economic life almost exclusively down until around 1890. It was the Western Electric Company in America which set up the first corporation school. It pioneered in the training of workers in America, not always uniformly, but still I would say that the Western Electric Company is today in the forefront of all American companies in regard to their training methods and training technique. They have set an example practically all of the time through what is now four decades. Now what has happened in the last few years, the last decade, is that the Western Electric Company and quite a number of other companies have been leading (instead of setting up corporation schools in which the formal classroom instruction was carried out in which you have those physical evidences of an educational job such as chairs and blackboards, crayons and books and all the rest of it) in shifting over to training the supervisor to train his own immediate associates on the job, under natural conditions of work, of responsibility, results to be achieved, etc. Now why has that happened? The old method did not work. I will give you an example: I know of a company in Connecticut which had one of the best corporation schools, using, so far as was practicable within a corporation school, the best of training, and yet that corporation school constantly found it difficult to get proper cooperation from foremen in the factory. In the acceptance of these "schoolboys," the foremen had had no responsibility for selection of the apprentices, they had no share in, and no responsibility for, the training of the apprentices, who were just sent over from the schoolroom. It has been found that a much more practical method was to get the worker out on to the job under natural working conditions and responsibilities.

For the great proportion of American business, of course no other course is practicable. The average American business can not afford

a school, can not afford an educational director, and can not afford classroom instructors. The only possible plan is to train in the factory, in the sales office, at the branch office, or in the clerical offices, as a practical measure. Another reason is that there has come into business in the last decade and a half a number of men (at least they have been in and out and back in again), men like W. W. Charters who is now Director of Educational Research at Ohio State, men like H. J. Kenagy of Life Insurance Sales Research Bureau, John Stevenson who used to be Dean at the University of Illinois and later vice-president of Equitable Life and later vice-president of the Penn Mutual Insurance Co., R. Uhrbrack of Procter and Gamble Company and others.

What did these men bring with them? They brought a new method—the project method of teaching—the training of men in actual life situations, by carrying out actual work in natural situations under normal conditions of responsibility. Many of our academic people today, from the pedagogical viewpoint, would give their eye-teeth for the training and educational opportunity which as at the hands, right in the hands, of every businessman, and in the hands of any supervisor whether it be in business or government. I refer to the opportunity to analyze jobs and job difficulties, the opportunity to find better ways of doing work; the opportunity to train, not tell, by having employees acquire correct habits of doing work, by actually trying to and ultimately doing it correctly; not by telling them how to think but by actually getting them to think; not by telling them how to put a sheet of paper in a typewriter but by having them do it, by demonstration and correction, over and over again until the correct habit of action has been formed. In business and in government, every one of us who has supervisory responsibility has the favored opportunity to apply modern pedagogy in contrast to some of the limitations which naturally pertain within academic circles. I want to repeat just at this point that *there is no such thing as training without the creation of new and right habits of action, and there is no creation of a habit of action without the doing.*

We have come to recognize in the last decade or more that *management or supervision is largely a training job.* Mr. Henry Dennison, president of the Dennison Mfg. Company, said to me one day that a group of executives of that company sat down one day and analyzed just what management is, and, after listing the things that happened every minute, every five minutes, every ten minutes, they came to the conclusion that nine out of ten things that a manager does could be classified as education and training. In other words, management is largely an educational and training job.

Now, there is another development that has occurred in the last few years. We have come to recognize that teachers are not born—at least not enough of them—that teachers are made, that it is possible to learn how to train other people. It is possible to become at least a better trainer of people than one otherwise would be. Dr. Thorndyke at Columbia has taught us also that the learning period does not end, the capacity to learn does not end, at 30, 40, 50, 60, or even 70 years of age; that the capacity of the individual to learn at different ages is very largely an attitude of mind rather than a change in natural

capacity. And so we have come to the point of view that this whole problem of training employees, whether it be in government or business, is a problem of training on the job, on actual work under normal conditions, turning out real work, real results. So we have to train the supervisor to train.

Now, what do we do when we start to train supervisors to train? First, we have to *develop certain instructional outlines*. These instructional outlines naturally are based on the job difficulties. There is no use teaching people what they already know. You teach them the things they do not know; start from what they do know or can do and carry forward beyond that. So the first thing is the development of instructional outlines. The *second* thing is to *develop the ability of supervisors to train through practice in right methods of training*. *Thirdly*, we must *provide in most organizations, facilities or guidance, often in the form of a personnel or educational department, to help carry on the training program*. Maybe, what I am going to say here is chiefly of interest to the personnel director or to the educational director or someone functioning as an educational or personnel director in regard to this training matter. The training job is the job of the supervisor. Helping to carry on the program is a job, however, of providing enthusiasm for and creating an interest in a training program. It is also a job of helping—and I say helping advisedly—to develop instructional outlines, often to help analyze job difficulties. Another part of the job is to prepare and approve the procedure for the training program; to take, perhaps, an active part in those conferences or round tables, which constitute that part of the training program which has to do with training supervisors to train; and finally, acting in an advisory relationship to the management in regard to the whole personnel problem.

Now I am coming to a field in which there is far too little known, and too little down in black and white. H. G. Kenagy has probably done more than anybody else in recording the technique of training. The trouble is that it seems to be hard for us to say what we personally do. We do not record what we do; we could not even tell exactly what we do. It is like dancing. We can dance, but we do not know how we do it, and cannot tell. A lot of the things we do are done on the spur of the moment. There are variations. Many of the things we do are done by indirection, and so when we talk about the technique of actually training people on the job there is little literature on the subject. Unfortunately, I am afraid, the fact that there is so little written on this subject of actual technique in training people on the job is probably an indication that relatively little is known about it, that we have done very little thinking about it. So there is an opportunity, here in government service, to help record some of these things that we actually do in training people for jobs and in doing their jobs better, and for analyzing them.

What are some of the techniques that are used? I suppose the most prevalent one might be classed as *absorption*. We *set* somebody down and let him observe and make mistakes and learn his own habits. We assume, of course, that a person is just lazy enough to do it

the easiest way. This is not true. We are just as likely to acquire bad habits of action, and they are ten times as hard to break.

The second is *telling*—what I am doing today; and it saves me all of the embarrassment of trying to make a demonstration, or of having you try it and then having me correct you afterwards. Telling is simply a lazy way, and we do it, most of us. Sometimes it becomes not just telling, but “bawling out.” Furthermore, *demonstration* alone is not training. Many of us go far enough to demonstrate how it ought to be done. That is one step. So I am going to turn now to the technique of training by *intention*.

First we analyze a job, discover what the difficulties are, what duties have to be performed, and not only what, but how, those duties ought to be performed. It is not enough to say what people should do. Good training includes insuring that they shall do it in a certain way. Training by intention involves another thing—an orderly progression starting with the simple and progressing to the complex—starting, of course, with what is known and then moving forward to the unknown. Have you ever started to instruct a new employee as to what he is to do? Have you ever encountered a situation where someone tells the whole story of the whole operation until the new employee is so utterly confused that he doesn't know what was said, and then is “bawled out” because he made a mistake in the very beginning? That is not training.

It seems to me that there are some essential steps in training by intention. First, there should be a *demonstration by the trainer* of a particular operation or task, with a few steps at a time with perhaps two or three demonstrations of the same thing. Then essentially should follow a *trial by the beginner*, then the *pointing out of mistakes*, followed by another demonstration and then another trial and so on until perfection is reached. There should then be *repetition, until correct work habits have been formed* and fixed in the trainee's mind and practice.

Now for some of the “how” of this training on the job. First, a *good demonstrator explains beforehand just what is to be done*, but, of course, not too many steps at a time. He will also explain the objective, stating why certain things are done. I spent some time, years ago, in chamber of commerce and community chest campaigns, and we had to work all hours. I have seen a staff of girls work overtime so long that they were ready to quit because they didn't understand why it had to be done. I have seen another campaign manager come along and say, “This is what we are up against. The situation is thus and so. If we do not do this, why, maybe we are not going to eat next week. The show will be over, etc., etc.” Then, everyone understood what it was all about.

I wonder how many of us adequately explain to our own associates what it is that we are trying to accomplish, in terms of the larger objectives, so what they are doing isn't just their own little sector of the task but part of the larger whole, which may have tremendous dramatic qualities about it. I know that we do not tell them that. Then the demonstrator needs to *tell the trainee what to watch for*. Then after a

demonstration the trainer-teacher needs to break down this operation, whatever it is, whether it is selling a life insurance policy or putting stamps on an envelope into its simple elements. You need to break the job down into all its parts; you need to ask the trainee questions that will bring out whether or not he understands fully, to give him an opportunity to ask questions which have come to his mind. In a sales demonstration, point out some of the strategy used, explain various points and answer any questions.

Another essential point is to *demonstrate one step at a time*. I have mentioned that before, calling attention to the way confusion is created in the minds of employees by telling too much at a time. Again, care must be taken to *put the learner at ease*. Some of us have got to learn how to smile even though we do not feel that way. We have all got to learn to make corrections with a smile. Another point in technique is to *have the right teaching order*. You can always do a better teaching job when you try to train the person just as the job difficulty has come up. In other words, the difficulty has come out of an actual situation, it is his problem, and you can impart instruction then in a more natural way. Another point is that we must *constantly prepare the learner's mind for the next job*, we must know the degree of understanding he has attained and not forge ahead of it, else what you are doing will be of no use at all.

Another important part of the technique of training is to *be certain that the training need is understood and the program for training supported from the top of whatever organization you are in, right down to the bottom*. This business of trying to carry on a training program, as some companies have done, without the whole-hearted support of the executive organization—just don't waste your money on it. Trying to carry on a training program because the president heard, on a golf course, that a competitor of his had done so, just is not a good enough reason for it. If training is to be a success in the Department of Agriculture or in the General Motors Corporation, it will become a success because everybody understands the need, the objectives, and, so far as possible, the technique of doing it, and of carrying it out, and the fact that the responsibility lies with everyone.

This subject of training is to me an epitome of the whole subject of management. It is not just a program for getting work done. To many of us it is more than that. It is a program for developing people, giving them more satisfying lives, at least more satisfying than otherwise would obtain, giving them new satisfactions that will keep them in some reasonable tune with life until, of course, we get a new set of human objectives. We find about every decade that something that was tremendously important ten years ago has given place to something new that is tremendously important. *It is a program for not only getting the job done, but also developing people.*

I have here a story from *Harper's Magazine*, which I want to read. It is called "The Tyrant of Corinth."

"A young man named Periander had become boss or tyrant, as they called it in those days, of his home town, Corinth, and was desirous of learning his trade from those who knew it best. So he

sent a messenger across the sea to a gentleman named Thrasybulus, who had been in the tyranny business for some time, and with notable success, asking him what a young tyrant ought to know. Thrasybulus took the messenger for a walk through a wheat field and listened to his questions, and answered not a word. Only as they walked along Thrasybulus kept looking at the wheat; and whenever he saw a stalk protruding above the rest he neatly snicked off its head. The messenger went home and reported that Thrasybulus was not only a boor who refused to answer questions, but a fool who destroyed his own property. But Periander understood.

"There were men of consequence in Corinth, men who towered above the crowd, men who might furnish leaders for an opposition if Periander ever became insufferable. Periander rounded up those men and snicked off their heads as Thrasybulus beheaded the stalks of wheat; and, thereafter, though he became insufferable enough, he had his own way in Corinth. It paid him, at the moment, to reduce the intelligence and capacity of the citizen body to the dead level of the average; but in the long run it did much harm to the state, and if Periander, who was the state, had lived long enough, he would have realized that he had merely been committing sabotage on his own property."

* * *

PERSONNEL PROBLEM No. 6

Here are two cases which present very real problems to the people concerned. In the first, the "supervisor" is decidedly not of the "boss" or "command" type, but a very conscientious individual that would like to "lead" but sometimes encounters difficulties in that apparently some employees do not like to be led to work. Also he feels a responsibility for the good conduct of his section and for getting worth while accomplishment from those under his direction. Through the presentation of his case the section chief is asking for help from our course. Can we help him?

Most cases have been considered from the supervisor's viewpoint. If the employee is unhappy, we blame the supervisor and say he is a poor leader. While we don't really, much of our talk would indicate that we considered the employee a non-resistant, passive individual that responded according to rule to "leadership," but is helpless to do anything on his own account. As a matter of fact, we know that the relationships between the two represent an interplay of the forces of two personalities. The boss is influenced by the employee almost, if not quite, as much as the employee is influenced by the boss. In Case II the boss has told the employee that he isn't expected to think, but if the employee really can think he will quit feeling sorry for himself and will begin to think up ways to handle the situation. If he can think faster than his boss, it is not necessary for him to be "thwarted at every turn." The trouble may not be in the boss at all but in the wrong approach of the employee.

Anyhow, what are some of the things he might do? What would you do if you were in such a situation? Of course your suggestions will be strictly "ethical."

Case I

Two employees of a small section work in a large room opening on the hall. One of these women is constantly leaving the room to "visit" people in other offices. Some of those visited try to discourage her visits by ignoring her presence, but this makes no impression on her. Others leave their offices while she is talking to them, but she only returns there later. There is always plenty of work for her to do and of enough variety to prevent boredom. Her section chief has suggested to her that she stay at her desk and finish her work. Any such suggestions about her work, though given in an impersonal and businesslike way, are not taken with a kindly attitude but produce vindictiveness, argument, emotionalism, and hysteria in an attempt to justify her actions. How can her section chief approach the matter?

Case II

A supervisor of young professional men told two of these men that they were not hired to think. Then later he accused a third young man of not being interested in his work.

What can a young man do to become interested in his work when he has been informed that he is not to think and when he is thwarted every time he shows any individualism?

COMMENTS ON DISCUSSIONS

Problem No. 6

The discussion of cases this time has been quite analytical and from a broad-gauge point of view. There seems to be less inclination to attribute all the blame to the supervisor and a decided tendency toward considering all the factors before drawing a conclusion. There was considerable tendency toward disciplinary measures, but, since our lecture on discipline does not come until next week, I am going to pass that over. There is one other thing, though, that has come up many times in the past that I do want to comment on. The following sentence quoted from a discussion of Case I brings it out rather forcefully: "She should be requested either to *transfer* to another department or to resign."

I refer to the use of the transfer. It is not good personnel administration to use a transfer as a method of getting rid of undesirable employees. Too often we have suggested settling cases by transferring some one. That does not settle anything. It merely passes the problem on to someone else. It's an evasion, not a solution.

Of course, the transfer has its legitimate use. It can be used to correct mistakes in placement, to open up new opportunity to deserving employees and for other purposes, but it should never be used on a trial-and-error basis—just on an off chance that an employee may do better. Transfers should always be for the good of the work and should be definitely planned for a definite purpose and with some degree of probability that the purpose will be fulfilled. The practice of passing an inefficient employee along from one group to another

and also the practice of permitting employees to shop around to find something they like can neither be justified.

For Case I there are quite a number of good suggestions. Possibly as good as any was that of an actual record in graphic form of the time spent outside the room during official hours. Such a record for a week or so would at least be a desirable basis to start from. In fact you can scarcely discuss the matter without it. It might, for example, show that the supervisor had overemphasized the difficulty—or it might show just the opposite. But that has been discussed by others.

As for Case II, I think it has been pretty well covered. It is about the commonest case there is, I think; and I've had a lot of experience on both sides of the fence. I well remember an exasperating supervisor some thirty years ago who persistently turned down hundreds of my suggestions for the improvement of the work. I remember also at a much later date having some of the very same suggestions made to me and in my turn being forced to turn them down—for the good of the work.

We have these young men coming to us year after year all full of what they think are new ideas that will revolutionize things but most of which have already been tried and rejected. They see one thing, one phase of a problem, draw their conclusions from that, and then wonder why the boss is narrow-minded that he cannot see the value of their suggestion.

The only solution I see is for the young men to keep trying. If they get discouraged and quit at the first rebuffs, they will never get anywhere. On the other hand, the supervisors should be as encouraging as possible. These young men must be trained to think, and to use effectively all the initiative they have. No where in the world is it more needed than in the government service.

LECTURE VIII

COMPLAINTS

By F. A. SILCOX

THINKING back to early experiences in the Forest Service, I recall my first contact with the complaint problem on a large scale. It was in northern Idaho in 1910, where I had 8,000 men on fire lines. They were fighting forest fires, about 125 miles from the base of supplies. There was necessity for building up, rapidly, a simple method by which the men would have the opportunity to set out their complaints in simple, direct fashion. We did it, and succeeded in getting through the fire without serious complications.

In 1917 we had a different situation. All the men were on a strike under the leadership of I.W.W.'s. If you will think back to 1917, you will remember what feeling there was in the United States and what propaganda there was against any revolting group in the country. You will remember, too the I.W.W.'s standing at that particular time, when it was worth anyone's social position even to have contact with them. You will understand, then, what it was to have to face 8,000 of them on the fire line.

We dealt directly with that group in 1917: made it easy and simple for the men to state their complaints and have them handled quickly. We went so far as to let the men set up their own committees, involving questions of pay, food, camp conditions, and the thousand and one things that come up in handling men in the woods a long way from the base of supplies. We found that a lot of difficulties we had anticipated disappeared through a frank, honest, and sincere approach to the problem. I did not care, did not think it my business, what creed of social philosophy they wanted to follow. The problem was that, in handling men in such large groups, frictions do arise and they have to be settled. I might illustrate different methods of approach by touching the high lights of this same case.

A foreman in one camp assumed the attitude that "if you don't like conditions, get out." Another followed the approach, "Let us find out the trouble, look into it, and see if it cannot be adjusted." (I find that that is the successful formula in government service, industry, or anywhere else.) In one camp, one day, a long-distance telephone call came in from the ranger in charge. There was mutiny there, he said, and if we did not send up the marshal, we were going to have trouble. Well, we had a long, rangy Tennessee chap with us, and he had a sense of humor. He went alone to that camp. When he got there he found that the ranger in charge was about as popular as a wildcat in a hospital. He was trying to control that heterogeneous group of men, who were unaccustomed to discipline, by strong language. Needless to say, they were not the type that could be controlled that way.

It is no exaggeration to say that those men would probably have buried that ranger in the hills if something had not been done about the situation.

The Tennessee chap first found out what the reasons for the complaints were in that particular camp. He found that the bedding had not come in and there was no food. Now when you have men lined up to fight fires, and they find there is no grub, you're bound to have a problem on your hands. Instead of trying to compel these men to be quiet, as the ranger had been trying to do, the fellow from Tennessee listened to them and allowed them to elect their own bosses and foremen. This took a little time, but in the meantime the bedding and grub came in. And the next day, the same men who had been in mutiny the night before worked way past their dinner hour. They showed up at camp three hours late because, they said, if they had left the fire it would have gotten away from them! There was no further trouble, because the men were handling their own complaints.

My own experience is that discipline from the outside is the poorest kind of discipline. With an ordinary group, self-discipline is most satisfactory. If there is reasonable fairness and reasonably quick liquidation of complaints, put the handling of complaints as far as possible into the hands of the group themselves. It is much more effective than handling complaints from the outside.

I have no high respect for titles or for men in an organization who by virtue of their position assume to know more than they do know. When we get deep down into complicated cases, my feeling is that there must be a spirit of democracy in our method of handling complaints, no matter what type, or how trivial or grave. I remember going into camps where there was trouble. I would investigate; talk with the men. In this way I would learn much more than I could by staying on the outside. I would gain their confidence; then give them my judgment. I cite this as an illustration of what I think is an effective method of handling complaints.

Here is another illustration of handling complaints among a heterogeneous group of people with no previous discipline. It involves all sorts of complaints, which had to be handled without any set-up of personnel, complaints against a background of high tension or revolt. This, too, indicates that, even with such circumstances, the approach with a democratic spirit is the best one.

This experience was in the Seattle shipyards, where we had 4,000 men during 1917 and 1918. Seattle at that (war) time was the only port putting ships in the water. Many men had come there from all parts of the country to help build ships at the call of their government. Every morning they could be found standing in the rain in front of the shipyard gates, until the few needed should be chosen.

The men fought among themselves—literally—to get jobs. Then the gates would slam and the man in charge would say, "Boys, come back in the morning." And next day they stood again in the shipyard's line in the hope of getting one of the few available jobs. This was a cruel and unintelligent way of dealing with the employment problem. There were bitter complaints. A process for liquidating those complaints had to be worked out. For ships were lying in the harbor

unfinished, and yet the United States was badly in need of ships. And employers were calling employees Bolsheviks; men were calling employers profiteers.

We met the situation. We organized a Central Employment Bureau. We had all shipyard labor passing through our Central Office. There were complaints of every variety and sort, of course. We became an office to liquidate all those complaints—to see that machinery ran smoothly. I remember one dramatic situation. I found men wouldn't stay in one of the yards. There were bitter complaints against the foreman and the working conditions. There was a huge turnover among the structural iron workers. They complained—said they couldn't drive rivets because there was not enough compressed air. We made a factual check-up, and we found in that particular yard they were trying to do something that was impossible. The men were revolting against poor craftsmanship, and the shipyards were damning the men in order to cover their own shortcomings—trying to blame the revolt on the men.

Handling this problem meant taking time and digging behind the scenes to find out the facts—to determine that the real basis of the complaints was not that the men were unwilling to work. There was a specific complaint—that the tools and the supply of air so that they could do a good job were not furnished. And the men were blamed, though it was not their fault. This complaint was not settled until after a factual analysis. And, when that analysis was made, it meant putting in better equipment. Then the turnover stopped, and the complaints stopped.

Other cases came up all through that shipyards experience. I remember a group of husky iron workers, all bitterly complaining that they were not dealt with fairly in a plant. They said they were being let out. I asked why. They answered that they were let out because of lack of steel, in the shipyard, to do the work. I called the manager of the plant and asked him if there was no steel. He said that was not the reason why the men had been let out. He reached to the side of his desk where I knew he kept his records and said, "Let me tell you why they were let out. All together they drove 21 rivets last night. That was the reason for letting them out."

When I told the men what the manager said, they yelled, "Let us tell you our story. We were put to work driving rivets on a ship that was being finished up. There were only 21 rivets to be driven so we divided up the work among us so no one would have a blank to turn in." Upon investigation this proved to be true. Yet the shipyard said the reason for letting them out was lack of speed. So you see that if our organization had not been impartial, and taken time to go into the case, we would have left an irritant that the men would not have forgotten.

The points I am making here are that in analyzing complaints, no matter what the machinery for handling them, the channels for investigation must be kept open, the investigation must be prompt and impartial, and liquidation of complaints must be clear, above board, and not delayed.

In the printing industry of New York City I had a totally different

experience from that with the I.W.W.'s. The latter, and the metal workers of the Seattle shipyards, were badly organized, undisciplined men. In the printing industry the psychological situation and atmosphere were entirely different. In that industry, the men come very close to professional and clerical workers. For, if you remember, printing was begun in a scholarly atmosphere.

I found the early English history of the printing industry extremely interesting. Wondering why printing shops were known, not as shops, but as chapels, I found back in the early development of the printing industry in England that the representative of the employees in the plant was known as the father of the chapel. I found, too, a very simple device for handling complaints in some of those early printing plants. They had a stone inside the chapel, or shop, and if you had a complaint you put a shilling on the stone. Then they tried your case. If you were sustained, you got your shilling back; if you were not sustained, the chapel kept the shilling. A simple device, this to prevent unnecessary complaints—to get direct, quick access to complaints and prompt hearing of them.

Now, you can build up all the elaborate schemes you want, but my own feeling is that in that little, simple chapel device is an approach which makes it possible to meet certain types of complaints directly and effectively.

In the New York printing industry there is an elaborate set-up dating back to 1850. It embraces a union and an employers set-up, with joint relations, with a highly developed system of jurisdiction. There are five boards for handling complaints, and separate boards for handling the problem of boy apprentices as against the mature group. There is, on questions of conflict and complaints, practically a supreme court in the industry. And the printing industry rates the second in size in New York City; it has had for long years methods by which the smallest apprentice-boy can get a hearing clear up along the line until his complaint is liquidated.

In some industries where there is employee representation, it is a question how far this representation can really go in opening up channels for the settlement of complaints. Where an employer organization is substituted for trade unionism and the seat of control is kept wholly in the employer's hands, for example, it is rather difficult to convince the employee that his hearing has been wholly fair and impartial. Here, again, fairness and a democratic approach are essential.

Joint union set-ups, such as those in the building trades, printing trades, etc., have functioned over long periods of time. In their backgrounds are whole lists of cases where certain precedents have been built up, and certain forms established for the handling of complaints and the rendering of decisions which involve principles that apply to the whole industry. There is, of course, one group of complaints that merely involves the individual. These can be settled easily, except that you may have to deal with malcontents. I remember the case of a young, very attractive Irishman, who loved to fight. He liked to create a row. No matter what the set-up for handling complaints, he always had to fight. So we *had* to put him in a place

where he *could* fight. No democratic approach ever convinces this type of anybody's fairness except his own. It is difficult to deal with this type; in fact I sometimes think it is almost necessary to put him in a psychopathic ward. But with ordinary, reasonable, intelligent people, a supervisor of the right personality, and proper approach through regular channels, 99 complaint cases out of 100 can be liquidated almost at the source.

During ten years' experience in the second largest industry in New York City, where all complaints passed over my desk, we kept records showing the number and character of complaints settled right inside the shop. Among the difficulties listed were some we called "chronics." When we went into those complaints, we usually found there was a personality in that plant that was either using arbitrary methods, was cordially disliked, or some fact of this sort that no amount of machinery could overcome. Sometimes the only cure was to go directly to the plant and say that the remedy was to move the foreman and put in a new one. During my experience, in fact, the foreman often came before the Joint Board, and in a great many cases the foreman rather than the workman was let out, much to the benefit of the plant.

Now, one difficulty in handling any organization set-up, whether in government service or in industry, is to reach certain entrenched positions which—occupied by persons who assert authority but do not have confidence or respect—have to do with personnel. To dislodge that particular person would clarify, sometimes, a whole series of complaints that come from a group of people who are perfectly justified in making them. Very often it is extremely difficult to get the incumbents of these entrenched positions (generally directory, supervisory, administrative forces) to realize that they themselves are, at times, the source of the trouble. Such a situation is not ordinarily so true in your general supervisory executive force, however, as it is along the line in industrial plants.

Let me illustrate, going back to my Seattle shipyard situation for a moment. I tried, there, to get men to go into the coppersmith's shop. I could not get them to go, and I wondered what the matter was. So I finally got hold of some of the men who worked in the shop and found that the foreman was very ill-tempered. When he got mad he picked up a hammer and threw it at one of the men. Needless to say, the workmen usually threw it back at the foreman, and when they didn't the foreman "rode" them. That was literally true. As a consequence, a good many fellows simply would not go into that shop to work. The only cure was, of course, to get rid of the foreman—to get a new foreman and let him handle the situation.

The point I want to make is that it is not only at the bottom, but also farther up, that a frank and democratic spirit must exist. It should permeate the whole organization if there is to be success in liquidating complaint cases. This is particularly true of the management.

I remember, by way of illustration, in one large collar-making plant, they had what they called a "combustion" committee, so named

because it blew up against action taken by the management. The plant, afraid they might be laying the foundation for unionism, was in a quandary as to whether or not they should meet this committee. However, they finally agreed to do so. The complaint was that the plant was introducing machines to sew buttonholes in collars at a rate that meant that people who had been doing that work for five or six years would have their earnings reduced, thereby lowering standards of living. When the whole matter was explained, a compromise rate was reached, the complaint was liquidated, and the people went back to work. But suppose they had said: "We, the management, know how this plant should be run. If you don't like the conditions in this plant, go look for work somewhere else." If this had been said, the chances would have been good for a serious labor situation within the plant. But by opening the channels, by a democratic approach, by having this committee come in and tell their story and face the situation squarely and liquidate it, there was no trouble.

Another case occurs to me—one in a packing plant in Chicago. A group of Polish women were doing work that was fed to them by a chain. This chain was speeded up so that it taxed the physical limitations of these women to keep up. In this plant there was no procedure set up for the making of complaints. So some of these women came to one who spoke reasonably good English and said: "Mary, you go tell the foreman about this chain going too fast for us." Now this woman finally got up enough courage to talk to the foreman, but he was of the arbitrary type, and fired her. As a result, there was a strike. As a matter of fact, it would have been perfectly simple to have adjusted this fast-running chain, but entrenched power felt so sure of itself that it did not even look into the matter.

This shutting the door, this attitude that management is a cabalistic, mysterious science born of authority and shrouded in mystery; this idea of the divine right of management is, I again repeat, one of the major sources of complaints and conflict.

Now machinery for handling complaints is necessary, of course. But I shall not go into machinery, records, and so on, here. There is nothing mysterious about them; they are necessary, but they're nothing but tools, after all. They should be simple, of course. And they will vary with the type and size of the organization. In a simple case John Smith comes to the foreman and tells him something is wrong; the foreman gives the matter his attention and the matter is settled. But in a very large plant, with its number of people, you have to have definite methods of formalizing the making of complaints and affording a chance for liquidation. Otherwise complaints go on and on and on, building up a background of irritation and sooner or later resulting in open rebellion.

Returning to the government service after ten years in industry, I find that channels for complaints are, relatively, open and that management has not the attitude of absolutism frequently encountered elsewhere. This is perhaps partly due to the democracy of modern government and partly to fundamental differences in the situation. For one thing, wages, work hours, and many of the other common

sources of trouble are removed from the immediate administrative field, and Congress has assured to employees, individually and collectively, the right to be heard on these matters.

There remains, however, that type of difficulty growing out of human relationships—the frictions and cross purposes that arise between workers or between the supervisor and the supervised. While the situation may be different from what it is in industry, human nature is the same. Grievances will arise, particularly if there is attempt at repression. The way out must be continually open. In government, as elsewhere, we must maintain our democratic principles of freedom and equality in getting a hearing. And when we do this the need for it diminishes.

As said before, I am not going to discuss the methods or the mechanics of maintaining open channels for complaints; this can be done in various ways. It is being done in various ways. If the principles which I have given you—and tried to illustrate by examples—are observed, the details are not important.

There is, however, one danger that must be consciously and systematically avoided. Whenever a procedure for receiving complaints is considered necessary, there must be some check established to prevent its being monopolized by chronic kickers and malcontents—the inefficient or those opposed to change or progress. Further, there is the danger of the machinery falling into the hands of cliques or agencies that seek to use it to further their own ends. Still another danger is that the machinery may be too far removed from the scenes of action. Ninety per cent of all complaints should be settled on the ground, in the office or unit in which they originate. But it is fundamental that the opportunity for appeal be kept open. It is also fundamental that the appellate agency be restrained from exercising administrative authority.

In conclusion, let me summarize briefly for you in one, two, three order the principles that must govern the most effective handling of complaints that necessarily develop wherever groups of men are found working together. These principles are universal. They apply in government as well as in industry. They are not many or involved, but few, simple and direct.

1. Channels must be kept open. Each individual must feel free to complain; must know where and how to register his complaint, and must feel assured that he is not jeopardizing his standing in doing so.

2. Liquidation must be clear, above board and not delayed.

3. Complaints when repressed grow and become explosive.

4. Liquidation must be based on facts. Investigations must be prompt and impartial. (This is just another way of saying what was said in a previous lecture: "The situation gives the order.")

5. There must be the right to appeal.

6. Self-discipline is best. If methods are democratic and personal; if the approach is frank, honest and sincere, 99 per cent of all cases will be settled right where they occur.

7. Whatever methods are adopted must apply to all, from the lowest supervisor to the highest executive.

8. Above all and pervading all must be the spirit of democracy.

In closing, may I say again that it is not a matter of technique; it is the spiritual approach that counts. In government we have access to most of the techniques; if in addition we keep in mind the true intent of democracy, the government service will become, as it should, not only the most efficient of organizations, but also, as it probably now is, the best place there is to work.

* * *

PERSONNEL PROBLEM No. 7

Lecture number seven was on "training." Please look at these three cases from the training viewpoint. Do they involve or indicate a need for training, and, if so, who needs it and what kind? Discuss each separately from this viewpoint. If you consider something else needed more than training, say so and point out why.

Use in each case, as you did last week, the analytical approach. Try to see why each person acted as they did. When you have done this you are in a position to say how to influence or change their acts. The cases are as follows:

Case I

A homesick girl was employed in a large department. Coming in during a rush of work, she seemed nervous and easily distracted. Errors if brought to her for correction would throw her into such confusion that she would be unable to do any worth while amount of acceptable work. Twice she broke down and cried, and her efforts seemed to have less satisfactory results as her length of stay progressed. She kept asking for transfer to another department in order to make a new start.

Case II

I have one employee who takes the position that every one in authority is against him, and assumes the attitude, why should he work hard under that condition. Of course his position is untrue, as such a condition does not exist in my section.

Case III

In a small office, one of several under an administrative assistant, orders, etc., coming through the chief of the section, usually are wrong or at least mixed up, so that, when the job gets back to the administrative assistant, it is wrong and the blame is laid on an employee other than the section chief.

COMMENTS ON DISCUSSIONS

Problem No. 7

The papers being turned in indicate that considerable study is being given to the course. They show reading and analytical thought. They show also, I think, a growing appreciation of the scope of personnel administration, its difficulties and its possibilities.

Further, I think you will agree with me after you have read the discussions of Cases II and III. I am not including any for Case I, although a number of the solutions turned in would, I am sure, have worked. You see I am told that that case is no longer a problem. The girl is now enjoying her work and doing it effectively. Wish I could report such a happy ending to all the cases I have given you.

And the method? It was simple enough. The supervisor asked two other employees to take the girl in hand and give her a boost. He asked a young man about her own age to help her with her work. With fear removed she soon learned. He asked an older girl to look after her outside of work hours. The older girl took her to room with her, so the living problem was settled. Nothing to it, you say! But think what might have happened had nothing been done.

Case II would be as easy to handle if it were in the same stage of development, but the probabilities are that it is older and more set. As many of you have suggested, it may date back to some previous job, to school, or to a still earlier date when the cop chased him and his playmates off the street.

More probably, it seems to me, this is his first job with a big organization. He came in and was put to work—told what to do. What the work was for or what it was all about he did not and does not yet understand. Things happen; others are moved, promoted, re-assigned. He sees the manifestation of authority without understanding its motive. He probably attributes more authority to his boss than the boss really has. What I am trying to get at is that this idea is common in large organizations due to a lack of understanding of where authority is, who exercises it, and why. The cure then would be understanding. Understanding, and an appeal to non-financial motives. Interest in the objective and the importance of the job itself is the only cure. An appeal to good work for its financial reward will not get lasting results.

The thing that has impressed me most since coming here is the commonness of the conflict attitude in Washington. Of course, I knew it was common in industry. It is the basis on which organized labor is built. But even there some do not admit it is necessary, even though there is more reason for it. High wages and high profits give a basis for antagonism. But in government work it is different; there is no occasion for conflict. We are all, workers and bosses alike, working for the same ends. And the end is always some worthwhile public service. The trouble, or at least one trouble, seems to be that too often the worker knows little of the purpose for which he works.

As to the prevalence of this idea of conflicting motives—it has been expressed in one way or another in hundreds of the papers turned in in this course. It is expressed in a bill now before Congress. It is in varying degrees, common. You do not need to be told why it is. Your own papers show that you now have the answer. Better training of supervisors and executives in the techniques of supervision will cure most of it. Chronic cases can not be cured. If the individual is badly afflicted, it will be best to encourage him to enter some other field where conflict has a real place.

Everyone sees at once where the trouble is in Case III. Neither

the administrative assistant nor the section chief is doing a good job. The only reason for this that I can see is that neither knows how, since it would be easier to do it right than the way it is being done. Too often we criticize the boss when really he is doing the best he can. He was trained as a chemist or a forester or an accountant; then he was put into a supervisory job with no training in supervision. What can you expect?

Our problem, then, is to train the section chief. Since only the employees have located the difficulty, it is their job. It can not, ordinarily, be done by going over his head and appealing to authority. Authority is normally a poor trainer. Sometimes a direct approach will work and sometimes not. Suggestion will sometimes serve. It is not an impossible task at all and in fact has been done, and is being done all the time. We train our boss just as surely as our boss trains us—but we do not so designate it. Where the right spirit of cooperation exists, it happens naturally without thought or question.

LECTURE IX

DISCIPLINE

By DR. HERMAN FELDMAN

I WAS told what was the purpose of my talk to you today by a member of your group, who said that you have been told how to be nice to employees and how to be good leaders and now you need someone to tell you how to be rough and tough. Why they should pick on me for this, I can not readily see. I certainly do not think any of my writings show me to be the ferocious person necessary for this job, except, perhaps, for one thing. In the report which I wrote in 1931 on the personnel program for the Federal Civil Service, I devoted fifteen to twenty pages to the form efficiency rating plan, and said what I thought of it. I said it was a snare and a delusion, and, having expressed what many other people believed but few said, I must have stamped myself as a man of great nerve.

Severity or harshness is not more than an incidental part of discipline in dealing with the misfit and unfit. The employee who is a misfit is, first of all, a problem to himself and then to the supervisor; and, if the supervisor handles this problem by firing him, he remains a problem to himself and to another supervisor. We want to find ways to handle such a problem constructively.

What is the matter with an employee who is a trouble? Usually we want to know two things about an employee: Does he do satisfactory work and, second, what temperamental traits does he bring to his contacts in his work? Out of those two simple classifications we have various permutations and combinations. First we have the employee who is a very good worker but is very troublesome because he has a personality difficult to deal with. Another type is the one whose work is poor but who is a very nice man or woman. This is an even harder problem. Then we have the type whose work is poor and whose personality is poor. This is the apex of the situation. The problem is what to do about these types of employees.

It is quite a big subject, and in trying to handle it I will first try to deal with certain major generalizations. After considering general methods of approach which are fundamental, I will take up certain standards of procedure which may be of value in the actual application to the job.

Now the first major generalization I want to precede by a little personal experience. It will illustrate the point I wish to make concerning the nature of supervisory ability and employee discipline. When I graduated from college, I taught for two or three months in public school. I had children about ten years old. I taught them everything, including singing, and drawing. Being six feet tall and the children only ten years old, I should have had no problems of discipline. However, it was the drawing lesson which gave me my first introduction to the problem of personnel management.

You know that in a drawing lesson within a period of thirty-five minutes there comes the problem of passing out about 48 sets of papers, crayons, models, erasures, other kinds of pencils, rulers, etc., and then getting the children's attention and collecting all 48 rulers, papers, etc. I discovered that in spite of my serious theories I had to abandon all kind ways and to whack right and left to maintain my superiority. Being troubled about the thing, I invited a more experienced man to tell me what was wrong. He said there was nothing wrong with the children—which I knew—but that there was with me. He showed me how he conducted a drawing lesson. He had monitors appointed for each of the main items for distribution. They stood in the front and the back of the room by previous arrangement, and there was even one appointed five minutes before the end of the hour to make him remember when the time was up. With the use of his system everything moved with perfect smoothness and precision.

The reason for this story is to drive home a point I wish to make, viz: that many problems of discipline that we have with employees are problems of supervisory ability.

This leads me to the first important generalization in a series of four or five which I include in the first part of my talk—that is, that *there is close relationship between supervisory ability and disciplinary problems*. It is true to a larger extent than we are willing to admit. The efficiency of employees, the *number of misfit or unfit, as a reflection on the supervisor and the organization itself*. I can give an instance of an extraordinary experiment done by a large insurance company in New York which has some twenty to twenty-two departments doing the same work. They worked out a system of costs and standards and then rated these departments in accordance with those standards. They ranged, of course, from one to twenty-two. Then they put some of the supervisors from the good departments in bad departments, etc. At the end of that year they found that there was a marked change. Some of the departments which had been poor the year before were doing good work, and vice versa. The third year they made a change almost at random, and the results at the end of the year tallied with the records of the supervisors. I can, therefore, reinforce with statistical demonstrations the fact that when a supervisor is having too many cases of misfits he needs to learn his own job.

What are the differences between good and bad supervisors as shown in the case just mentioned? In the first place, I have already mentioned technical efficiency of one against the other in the performance of the job. All of us know what an awful thing it is to work under an inefficient supervisor who does not give definite instructions or who does not provide and maintain definite standards. The other side is the question of personnel and personal handling.

Another phase of the problem of handling the misfit and the unfit from the preventive standpoint is the question of the initial selection of employees. Some supervisors do not realize the importance of selection. Are your ways of selecting people effective? That is your job to learn. To make you realize that that is a responsibility, I will illustrate the importance of it by telling a story. I have a friend who hired men in a war industries plant. He had a paymaster's window

and usually would see only a face and shoulders of an applicant. He would discuss the job with him, give him a slip, and tell him to go in. One day he followed the usual procedure with an applicant. When he had hired the man and given him a ticket, he disappeared. My friend was astonished. We rushed to the pay window and saw walking away a midget about $2\frac{1}{2}$ feet high who had been standing on a box. The point of the story is that you must see all of a person to be able to do a good job of selecting.

There are various ways of hiring, and there is a certain technique of hiring. A company which hires insurance salesmen found that the records of employees who had been interviewed three times or more by the supervisors before hiring were better on the job than those of the employees who had been interviewed only once. There is a whole science and art of selection with which you must be familiar and on which lots has been written.

Now, there is one definite limitation to this, and it is that with all our technique, with all our knowledge, it still is true we can not help but make mistakes in all the different forms of selection. The government service provides one way by which a real test can be made, but I deplore the fact that when I studied the subject of federal service here some years ago, and as I have reason to know about it now, that method is not used by supervisors, and therefore, to a large extent, it has failed. This is the probationary period provided, a period during which there is a chance to test, if necessary two weeks, two months, or six months, the employee as to whether he fits the government service. But many a supervisor supinely allows an unfit person to drift past him to some other department, there to create a problem. And, of course, once an employee has acquired status, nothing very much can be done.

Another illustration of the effects of the supervisor's personnel process is in the inadequate recognition of the employee through promotion. It is possible for a good employee who is ambitious and who does not see anything in sight, to go sour because his supervisor does not give him any inkling as to what he may expect; it is possible for such an employee to develop a sort of promotion psychosis, and that promotion psychosis is the point of view of the fellow who does not know where he is going; who has been passed up several times and goes along wondering when in heck the supervisor will do so and so, until it begins to poison his whole attitude and preoccupies him when he should be doing other things.

I won't go through the whole problem of personnel administration because that is impossible, but I do want to revert to the fact that one great difference between the good and bad supervisor, aside from his technical management, is the practical application of principles of personnel administration, and from that standpoint I think it is the beginning phase of any attempt to deal with the misfit and the unfit.

However, I am not trying to put this on an unrealistic basis. We still will have a certain number of employees who, in spite of all our efforts, will be careless and inefficient, lazy, insubordinate, or difficult to deal with, and the question comes up: What are the supervisor's obligations in this case and what should be done about it?

I will make a second major generalization. The second major generalization would be that the *primary obligation of a supervisor in matters requiring disciplinary action is to try to understand the case.* That sounds awfully simple, but it is not so simple as it sounds. As an example:

I remember the case of an employer who came down from his Olympian office to the basement, and, having been used to deference, was very much surprised to find one of the personnel leaning against a box leisurely smoking a cigarette, and when this employer came along the employee did not budge a bit but kept right on smoking. The employer was incensed at this conduct and came over and asked: "Young man, how much do you earn a week?" "Eighteen dollars a week, sir," the young man replied. "Well," raged the employer, "here's \$18 and get out." The boy left in a hurry, not at all displeased. By this time the foreman arrived on the scene. "What is the name of that fellow?" inquired the employer. "I don't know," replied the foreman. "What is he doing here?" demanded the irate employer. "Why, he is a messenger boy just arrived with some goods," explained the foreman.

Now, we all know there are cases very much like this. I know of an actual case of an employee who had been late five or six times, and the seventh time his lateness was due to the fact that he had taken the child of his boss to a hospital for emergency treatment because he had been hit by a ball. He came to work a half hour late and the supervisor started bawling him out and fired him on the spot, which, of course, was a very foolish act.

Turning back to the point of the importance of understanding in disciplinary cases, I want to emphasize something that is merely a reiteration of what you know—that so many of the cases that are difficult to deal with are hard to understand. Take, for example, the employee who seems to be lacking in efficiency—seems to be unable to finish a day's work. Perhaps you have talked to him or her several times. Now, it is perfectly possible that a perfectly well employee may temporarily have an abscessed tooth or some condition which might produce a state of anaemia, temporarily, which would lower that person's efficiency to within 50 or 60 per cent. of normal. Or an employee may be faced with a personal worry—it might be a love affair, or perhaps jealousy—and may not return to normalcy for weeks or months or years, depending upon one's sophistication.

I hope you all are psychoanalysts. We all are nowadays. I have a friend who when asked "How are you?" always replies "Frust Rate." Now, you ought to know a good deal about the fact that some cases can not be handled in ordinary common-sense ways at all. Let's take an instance like this. In many departments you have employees who seem to be ill much too often and some of those illnesses the doctors themselves can not fathom. Now, they may be suffering from a functional or organic disorder. It may happen in this way. We will say a girl is, perhaps, unpopular in her set, has no one making very much of a fuss about her, perhaps is not treated with enough respect to satisfy her ego, and then, after a year or two of musings and wonderings about this, perhaps she suddenly acquires some serious illness

that may last a month or two. Suddenly this person becomes the next thing to a queen. She is put in a hospital; she can ring bells; she has visitors; her office friends send her flowers; she has had more candy than she has had in years, and she likes the whole experience. Now, it is perfectly possible that at some other time that employee wishes she were sick again, and, without going through the whole process, it has often been found that the employee develops a psychosis, a tendency toward illness that is simply baffling to the ordinary medical specialists.

The supervisor can not do anything with such types of employees, but he should know something about that kind of case, know that there is treatment for it but that he is not in a position to handle it. The thing that supervisor might find it desirable to study is something about psychiatry and the psychiatric approach. Psychiatry is not psychoanalysis. I make a distinction because anyone may claim he is a psychoanalyst who has read a book on it and talks about it. There are some very successful psychoanalysts who began that way. They found their friends brought their troubles to them; they became psychoanalysts. But a psychiatrist is a man who has actually gone through the process of technical training in that branch of medicine.

Psychiatry began with the analysis and treatment of the insane, the feeble-minded, the hopelessly neurotic. It then became known that many people in life who are not in institutions, and who may be able to function with regard to most of their conduct, do have one or another form of neurosis, and psychiatry has contributed a great deal toward the relief of those afflicted in this way. The distinguishing feature of the psychoanalytic approach is the completeness of its analysis. It does not merely take one single instance, or an act which is a misdeed, and undertakes the treatment on that. It considers the person's health, his ability, his emotional make-up, his social relations, his home life, his job relations, and a great many related facts, and sometimes out of that you get a picture which enables you to do something about it.

In case this subject is interesting to you, I might suggest a book called "Psychiatry in Industry." It is written by a man who used to be a psychiatrist for R. H. Macy & Company. It is written by Dr. V. V. Anderson, and published by Harpers. If you are interested in becoming amateur psychoanalysts, there are one or two other books which you might like to know about. One is an older book, twenty or twenty-five years of age, which tells you how bad it is to repress. It is Hart's "Psychology of Insanity," and the other book I wish to suggest is a companion volume to it but which treats the subject from another point of view. It is Dr. Myerson's book, "The Psychology of Mental Disorders."

The use to the supervisor of psychiatry and psychoanalysis and all these fancy subjects is not to make him start practicing it; if so, I have done an awful lot of damage to the people of this community. But, if he knows something about it, he may be able to recognize the difficulties of some of the cases he deals with; he may be able to pass helpful information on to the medical officer connected with the unit; he may even be able to suggest something to the psychoanalyst.

In any event, he is likely to have a better understanding of cases than merely by using the common-sense applicable to common-sense people.

I make a third generalization here which is almost obvious from the one I just discussed. Aside from the obligation of the supervisor to understand each situation *individualization of treatment is essential in the manner of handling disciplinary cases*. Every case has to be handled with a desire to make the treatment adequate to that particular case. There are no routine cases in the experience of the intelligent supervisor. Each case has its own formula, and the supervisor should try to define that formula and apply that particular formula.

Suppose we now try to apply some ideas to the ordinary employee who is not necessarily to be subjected to very specialized psychiatric treatment. What is it that is so often inadequate in the methods used by supervisors?

First, I would ask you a question. Are you all members of the National Association of Free Dispensers of Advice? Are you with me as a charter member of the Society to Reform Other People's Lives? Now, we, all of us, have occasion to see how other people's lives are right and we have taken occasion to give advice. The most baffling part of that advice-giving process is the fact that so often we get someone who does agree with us and who says, "You are absolutely right; you certainly have hit it on the head," and promises to do the right thing. Maybe he does it for an hour or week, but things are about the same a week later. Of course, no great harm is done except the loss of your time and your regrets for ever having meddled with the case. I must confess that this has been the case in 98 per cent of my own experiences. I would like to know why; and, it seems to me, the answer to my query is this—that most of us can not profit by advice because we are too habit-bound. Without a patient, determined effort to help the employee to change his habits, without insistence that he do so, he will often be unable to mend his ways.

Most of us can not profit by advice because we are too habit-bound. What good would a golf professional do in telling us something and then not coming around again for another six months? If we had a golf professional who would see us two or three times a week instead of every six months, even the worst of us would generally hit a pretty good score.

My fourth main generalization is that in many hard cases of discipline the chief task of the supervisor is the painstaking job of up-building and retraining the habits of the person involved. If you can't rebuild that person's habits, you will be of very little use to the person and you won't solve the problem. Again, if you would like a suggestion of a book or two—one by Professor E. D. Smith, "Psychology for Executives." There is a chapter on how to build and rebuild habits, which is extremely helpful and has practical points. Another book which is much harder to read, but is extremely helpful, in John Dewey's "Human Nature and Conduct."

I now come to the Wild West part of the picture. A generalization, which is number 5, is that *in many cases severity of punishment is essential in order to break the chain of bad habits and to shock the person into a recognition of the need of getting control of himself.*

I have no desire to add to the sum of human misery by having you go out to "fire" a lot of people. Fortune is not fickle—she singles out favored sons and daughters and makes of their lives just one round of bliss, and others get into an endless rut of trouble. I am convinced that many people, if not most, need kindness, not severity. Encouragement may be just the thing which brings them out of a vicious cycle. I have seen many instances of that.

I wonder if you ever tried to reduce your weight. If you look at the scales morning after morning and find that you are a pound or two over, there comes a time when you will practically give up. There was one instance of a man whose wife was trying to reduce. She weighed herself every day but saw no improvement. So he fixed the scales, unknown to her, so that she was encouraged by the loss of one or two pounds, and she thereafter really did cut out the things she had always meant to cut out.

However, there is a danger in being too kind. What is kindness, anyhow? When are we kind? My observation is that we are futile in many of our applications of kindness. We know that a father may be over-indulgent to his child. In real life many of our cases are affected. A surgeon does not weep about having to let blood. In personal life we often think we are kind when, if we were honest, we would know that it is due to timidity and cowardice. A hard decision is the best decision often. There was a college professor in a western college who drank too much. He just could not get himself to stop. Finally, the president called him in and asked for his resignation. It was a hard thing. It was one of the best things because that person was given a shock which he needed to reinforce his will. He quit drinking.

We find that sometimes a threat of something is the one thing that bolsters us up. He is not truly kind who is not willing to do the hard and necessary thing in the case of an employee. That is particularly bad in the case of the public service. We do not want poor and inefficient workers there.

If, therefore, it is necessary to use hard and disciplinary measures in conferences with employees, there are certain standards which will apply to the handling of the cases.

This approaches the "how" side. What procedures apply assume that disciplinary action is necessary.

In the first place—preparation. In every case the supervisor should be thoroughly prepared and know what he wants to do. He should know all the facts, which will give him more self-confidence in dealing with the employee. He should know just what line he should take with this employee. He should be sure to secure from above approval for the tentative action. As a starter, the supervisor who does not plan for any action may be at a disadvantage in having to strike an attitude in which he is often forced to back down.

Second, all supervisory discipline should be done in *privacy*. An employee may react differently in front of others. Therefore, there is no place for public action of a disciplinary kind. Deal with the case when you have had a chance to plan and prepare.

Third, in a great many situations *timing* is particularly important.

The right time is often of extreme importance to the supervisor. I don't suggest that the supervisor should immediately take action. It might be as well to wait a day or two, but it should not be so far off as to create doubt and uncertainty.

Fourth, a *judicial attitude*. For instance, is a supervisor who has an action to perform open-minded throughout when he confers with an employee, or is he there to make a case, as is often true? Does the supervisor permit the employee a full expression of opinion? Does he handle the case free from emotion and bias, showing his desire to do the right thing rather than to justify a previously arrived at opinion? If a new and unexpected point comes up, is the supervisor prepared to stop right then and there, giving himself time to think, or does he go through with it, leaving an employee bitter? Is the supervisor willing to reverse himself entirely?

Fifth, *the manner or style in which it is done*. There are many supervisors who have the right idea in their minds and are very much surprised that they can't get the employees to take it in the spirit meant. A person's voice may be too high; a person's whole attitude may put the employee on the defense before he should do so. It is very desirable for a supervisor to take a screen test of himself.

Sixth, *the principle of each case is to establish a right precedent*. If you do something as a matter of expediency, it will plague you for the rest of time. Therefore, you have the job of determining what is the right thing to do. How can one answer that? There are some cases when just an ordinary bit of sarcasm will take care of it. A person needs to be told the truth or be laid off or be demoted. When you once begin to try to figure out just what is wrong with this particular case you ask yourself, "What have I done? How ought I to do it?" It gets to be one of the most interesting phases of leadership. The supervisor takes his place as professional man, as he ought to be.

If you begin to look upon every one of the persons under you as a case worth studying, the job of supervision becomes the most fascinating game you can think of. It is the case with school teachers. One will say, "What a dull job!" Another will be just thrilled with the job, having any number of anecdotes to tell about the children.

Now, I, therefore, will not try to go into the details of what ought to be done in the individual cases. I don't think it can be of much value in a general lecture. I say that the job is a professional one requiring a great deal of thought—one from which he learns from experience.

I have one instance I know of. It worked out quite opposite from what people intended. There was a huge club down south with a negro porter who was the only one who knew the mysteries of the club—the cellar, the locker room, etc. Consequently, this employee was very necessary, although he kept on giving trouble. The man was getting \$15.00 a week in the post-war year 1919. Everyone urged that he be fired. The man in charge went to him and told him that he certainly was doing marvelously, that he really ought to be getting a higher salary than at present, more like what he had been receiving previously. He told the porter that they were increasing his salary

by two dollars from then on, and, if possible, they would increase it by two more later. That difference in money incidentally made a terrific difference in the whole attitude of the employee. He became a wholly different thoroughly affable employee.

I, therefore, will conclude this talk by telling you that I congratulate you upon your opportunity to try novel ways of dealing with such situations. Make a study of each case; broaden your background; make full use of your experience. You are certain in time to become a more wise and effective supervisor and to minimize the cases of and difficulties with the unfit and misfit.

* * *

PERSONNEL PROBLEM No. 8

Many of the cases that you handed in and also a great many of your comments on the problems I have given you for discussion indicate that there is considerable injustice in the government departments in Washington. Of course, there is some injustice. No big organization is perfect. The members of an organization are human. Some injustice is bound to creep in. But is there really any considerable amount of it here? If so, what is its cause and what can be done to correct it? Those are the questions I am asking you to discuss this time. Lecture No. VIII was on "complaints." How is that related to our problem? Would a more democratic method of handling complaints lessen injustice? Based on our study so far, what is your suggestion?

The following cases are not for discussion. They are included as being typical of cases which I have said indicate injustice. Possibly they do not. Possibly an investigation in each case would show misunderstanding instead of injustice. Even if this is true, still isn't there something wrong? How right it?

Cases

What can a professional employer do about a clerical worker who holds up the work turned in by the professional person if the chief executive of the office seems not to have the courage to insist on fairness in the office?

* * *

A woman who will not take blame for any of her own errors, but blames *every* error on her partner, is shown preference by the men chiefs, and given promotion. She is unpopular with the women with whom she works because of her disposition and her vile stories.

* * *

In a certain bureau, all messengers and mail clerk work $\frac{1}{2}$ hour longer daily and on Saturdays 1 hour longer than other employees. All are white employees; three shifts are working and shifts overlap, 2 to 2½ hours. This extra working time causes dissatisfaction, lack of enthusiasm, discontent, a feeling that they are being imposed upon,

and stimulates an already necessarily high rate of personnel turnover.

* * *

An original-minded scientific investigator says that all his findings are minimized, destructively edited or appropriated by his chief, the one who does the work receiving no recognition.

* * *

COMMENTS ON DISCUSSIONS

Problem No. 8

The consensus of opinion is, or seems to be, that there is too much injustice but that "injustice" is scarcely the right word—bad situations due to inefficiency or misunderstanding comes nearer expressing it. There is practically no wilful injustice.

Any sort of an analysis brings out the fact that the government does more for and gives more thought to the welfare of the individual worker than practically any other employer. Working hours, vacations with pay, salary rates (in lower grades), working quarters, facilities, retirement, and all the other things that employees the world over are striving for, government employees have to a greater extent than almost any other group. Yet government employees are dissatisfied and complain of unjust treatment. Why is it?

Attempting to appraise your answers rather than to give my own opinion, the reason seems to be psychological and intangible rather than physical or concrete. The emphasis has been too much on the individual and not enough on the work. And only work-accomplishment can satisfy. No man ever did get promotions enough or pay enough or anything else enough to satisfy him for any length of time. To enjoy one's work, one must be interested in it, the work, rather than the salary. Labor unions strike for high wages because wages are tangible, but that intangible something that goes with worthwhile work well done means more than higher wages even to underpaid labor. It is instinctive; we all like to do a good job.

Government employees are engaged in the biggest, most important work in the world today. The job of the civil employees is greater than that of any other group, including industry, yet the work itself is seldom used as an appeal. It seems that in general employees seldom think of their work as important, frequently do not know its importance, its purpose, its use, or its relation to the present crisis, future prosperity, or anything else. The greatest appeal the job has is therefore lost, and lacking an interest in the job employees interest themselves in such tangible factors as credit, overtime, transfers, etc., presumably trying to live up to their reputation for inefficiency and lack of initiative ascribed to them by industrial writers.

Also your papers indicate that in your opinion the government service compares unfavorably with industry in the quality of its personnel administration and in training for its supervisors and executives.

But the thing most mentioned is the lack of any recognized method for taking care of complaints. Seemingly no government department recognizes the benefits of well-organized employee representation or the psychological need for the expression of grievances. A few favor an outside court of appeals with authority to enforce its findings, but the majority recognize that giving authority to those without administrative responsibility would be poor organization and would promote inefficiency and discontent rather than remove it. Both efficiency and justice can be achieved within the unit if all the facilities of the unit are used. Something should be done about complaints, but there seems to be a real danger that it will be the wrong thing. As a matter of fact, our course has outlined the method of correcting undesirable practices and making the government the most efficient as well as the most important organization, and, above all, the finest place there is to work.

LECTURE X

SUMMARY AND APPLICATION

By W. W. STOCKBERGER

THE topic assigned for my talk this afternoon is a "Summary and Application" of the elements of personnel administration which have been presented to you in the nine lectures to which you have listened, but my inclination is to put aside the question of a systematic review and, instead, to present for your consideration some of the thoughts which have come to me as this course of lectures unfolded. In the first lecture you were told that the purpose of this course was to focus attention on those human relations which exist between supervisors and subordinates, and from this central theme I shall endeavor not to wander too far afield.

Unless something definite has been learned from this course, and the desire aroused to use what has been learned as a controlling factor in our daily relations with others, then the primary purpose of the course has not been fulfilled. At the outset it seems entirely appropriate to inquire, "*What* have we learned?" Although all have heard the same lectures, studied the same problems and, to a large extent, consulted the same reference books, it by no means follows that we have all learned the same things. Moreover, if it has been our practice, during this course of lectures, to reject without further thought or consideration statements which were at variance with preconceived opinions, and to accept only those ideas which coincided with our own beliefs, we have *learned* nothing. If we have merely felt a glow of satisfaction when we could agree with the statements of the lecturer, and a feeling of disapprobation when we could not, I repeat—we have *learned* nothing.

There have been repeated, within my hearing, statements made by a number of those who have listened attentively to the several lectures, from which it appears that there exist varying degrees of opinion as to the validity of some of the assertions made by the different speakers, and as to the merit of some of the subject matter which has been presented. I would not be understood as condemning honest dissent from any of the opinions which have been expressed from this platform, but my sympathy is entirely alienated from that type of disagreement which is exemplified by the store-box philosopher, who lacks either the desire or the intent to modify his own opinions and whose method of argument consists chiefly in searching his memory for some telling retort with which to confound and silence his opponent.

Learning is a process which is more or less painful, a process which requires the reshaping and often the abandonment of cherished and long-established beliefs. In many respects learning may be likened to the tearing down of an old house and its replacement by another structure more ample in proportions and equipped with the latest

products of invention and art. It means the breaking of long established habits of the mind and the forming of new ones, a task which requires prolonged and serious effort for its accomplishment. It means the reexamination of the factual basis for our beliefs and opinions, and their modification whenever new and admissible evidence is presented.

Openmindedness is the door through which we may enter new fields of knowledge. Prejudice, often mistaken for knowledge, may close the mind to a new point of view, when a careful consideration of the facts involved and an impartial weighing of the evidence presented would lead to its adoption. That man who, on seeing for the first time a giraffe, stared at him thoughtfully for a long time, then with a dubious shake of the head remarked, "There ain't no such animal," was no more illogical in his attitude than the one who stifles the spirit of inquiry, closes the mind to new ideas, or regards as a settled judgment a conclusion based upon imperfect knowledge.

May I now refer to the gratifying and enthusiastic response which met the announcement of this course of lectures, and point to certain conclusions which, from the extent of the interest aroused, appear to be well founded. One of these conclusions is that, in your minds, personnel administration is not regarded as an exclusive function of personnel officers, but that there is a realization of the part which each individual plays in the personnel administration of his group. In several of the lectures there has been some discussion of the relations of the supervisor to the supervised, and of the relations of the supervised to the supervisor. These relations may be considered as forming two sides of a square, to complete which must be added the two remaining sides, namely, the relation of supervisor to supervisor, and the relation of supervised to supervised. Any breakdown or the development of instability in the normal interdependence in one of these relations adversely affects each of the remaining three.

These considerations lead me to suggest that we are in fact concerned with what I shall for convenience call personal administration, as distinguished from personnel administration. Personal administration is purely subjective, its seat and sole authority lies within the mind of the individual; personnel administration, on the other hand, is objective, since it is conceived as a system which has authority exterior to and independent of the mind of the individual. Personal administration will be successful in proportion to the extent to which the individual displays the characteristics of self-control and sensitivity to human traits and reactions. It is equally essential to those who aspire to leadership within their group, and to those whose responsibilities require them to exercise a degree of control over the activities and welfare of others.

Another conclusion which may be drawn from the interest manifested in this course of lectures is that we are becoming more personnel conscious, that we are beginning to realize the existence of certain well-defined principles which, if fully understood and consistently followed, will bring about a more harmonious adjustment of the personal relations between the members of any working group, will make

the performance of the daily tasks more pleasant, and will result in a more effective and more efficient type of service.

At this point allow me to digress for a moment to discuss briefly some of the various concepts of personnel administration or as it is often called, personnel work, which are likely to be revealed whenever this subject becomes the topic of conversation. To one, the keeping of appointment records and the checking of classification sheets to see that they are in proper form is personnel work; to another it is applying the civil service rules and the decisions of the Comptroller General; and to a third it is the imposition of penalties for infractions of rules or regulations. No one can deny that these cases represent an essential and important phase of personnel work or that a high standard of efficiency must be maintained for its satisfactory performance. However, it is to an entirely different phase of personnel work, one that offers an enlarged opportunity for constructive and helpful service, that our attention has been directed throughout the preceding lectures.

In every organization a large part of the personnel administration lies beyond the recognized field of those who are designated as personnel officers. Each employee whose position invests him with authority to direct the work of others plays his part in personnel administration. This holds true for the chief of a bureau, and on down the line to a head messenger or a foreman of laborers. In his discussion of Problem 5 Keplinger told us that what is needed in government service is fewer and better chief clerks or personnel officers. I would add that there is also needed a broader understanding and wider application of the principles of personnel administration in our various divisions, sections and other units of supervision. Personnel practice has not kept pace with the expansion in so many other directions. Important personnel decisions are made in disregard of the most elementary principles of sound administration. The result is that much public money is spent for which there is not an adequate return in the quality of the service rendered and the volume of work performed.

Let me illustrate this point by a specific example. Some years ago a man was appointed to perform a specialized service for which he was unusually well qualified. Although crude in demeanor, careless in dress, and unprepossessing in appearance, his work soon came to be highly regarded, both for its intrinsic value and for its applications in various fields of investigation. In recognition of the service which he had rendered, and with a fine disregard of his obvious deficiencies in the qualities of leadership and executive ability, he was placed in an administrative position as the head of an important division. His unwise decisions, due to inexperience, eventually disrupted the morale of his division, and his failure to recognize that the possession of authority carries with it the obligation to refrain from its abuse led him to adopt certain devious practices which necessitated his dismissal. And so a promising career was ruined, and the government was deprived of a valuable type of service, as a result of a bad personnel decision.

In another instance an employee who had displayed unusual ability in a specialized line of work was made the head of a section which

was engaged in the work in question. It was not long before complaints were made that the new supervisor made it a practice to deride members of the group who asked information or guidance in the work, and to reproach them in sarcastic words, insulting to their intelligence. This treatment soon produced a state of nervous tension, which finally resulted in several cases of hysterics, the cause of which was traced to the supervisor, who was promptly shorn of administrative responsibility and reduced to the ranks. Under another supervisor the group quickly regained a normal attitude. In this case, as in the preceding, morale was lost, productive work interrupted, and an employee disgraced, again as a result of bad personnel decision.

In my judgment these two unfortunate employees were less deserving of censure than the executives who placed them in positions for which they were not fitted and who apparently failed to give any serious consideration to their suitability for an administrative assignment. The time may come when it will be recognized that unusual proficiency or excellence in bookkeeping or chemistry or economics does not imply similar excellence or proficiency in the art of administration or management; a time when promising research workers, under the guise of a reward for meritorious service, will not be converted into mediocre administrators; a time when the standards of attainment prerequisite for entry into personnel administration will be at least the equal of those observed in the selection of workers in any scientific or professional field.

A few days ago I was an interested listener to a conversation participated in by an active-minded, youthful executive and another of mature years. The subject under discussion was the general knowledge or educational background needful for intelligent and successful personnel administration. In the course of the conversation the older man said: A good personnel administrator is a well-rounded individual of more than average ability in a large number of traits. He has an intelligent grasp of many different subjects without being a specialist, necessarily, in any one of them. He is on speaking terms, at least with psychology, since he must understand some of the causes of undesirable emotional tension among groups of employees; with physiology, that he may appreciate the relation between physical working conditions and working efficiency; with psychiatry, in order to comprehend matters involving mental abnormality which appears all too frequently in the affairs of everyday life; with pedagogy, since at times he must play the part of instructor or teacher; with economics, as it relates to policies of employment and compensation; and with the history of the causes which have brought into being the complex social forces which characterize our civilization today.

To this rather formidable list I cannot resist the temptation to add, a sense of humor, which after all is largely the ability to see ourselves from the point of view of others when the joke is on us, and common sense, sometimes called "horse sense," and facetiously defined as the sense which a horse has but which a mule lacks. But all this is only one way of saying that for a personnel administrator we do not want a man with a command of a particular technique only, but one with readiness, adaptability and versatility. We might go so far

as to say that he should be trained in the social sciences, rather than having specialized in chemistry, mathematics or entomology.

I am now about to mention a viewpoint which may meet some opposition, or may even be dismissed without consideration, which is, that personnel administration must be raised to professional rank and standing before we may properly insist upon, or recognize, the type of training and education which should be a prerequisite for the more advanced positions in this field. The principles of the science of personnel administration are as clearly defined and understood as those of the so-called social sciences or of economics. For the understanding and satisfactory application of these principles, the requisite degree of training in a wide range of collateral subjects is at least the equivalent of that required of college graduates. The librarian, the Patent examiner, the dentist and the sociologist have been accorded professional recognition under our existing classification plan. Is personnel administration to remain forever without the pale?

Let me now refer to the subject previously mentioned as personal administration. By this is meant the control which an individual exercises, or should exercise, over his own actions, attitudes and relations to others. The majority of our troublesome personnel cases arise from the want of such control, sometimes on the part of the supervisor, sometimes on the part of the subordinate, and sometimes on the part of both. The individual who is unable to govern and control himself is certainly unsuited for the responsibility of exercising authority over others, and is apt to find himself in constant conflict with those who are in position to exercise authority over him.

Many of the complaints made of supervisors can be directly traced to the narrow-minded, short-sighted, selfish or inconsiderate attitude displayed by the supervisor toward his subordinates. One drives subordinates almost to desperation by a petty insistence on the observance and technical application of the letter, rather than the spirit of the office rules; a second resents all display of initiative by members of the group supervised, which is ruled much after the manner of a monitor of a prison work-room; a third requires that permission be asked and granted before any one of the group may leave desk or room during working periods; another, in order to show authority or to impress a superior, makes some trifling and unimportant change in all finished work presented for inspection; and yet another tears up the letters carefully prepared by his stenographer if she ventures to correct his slovenly English and faulty diction.

On the other hand, there is the subordinate who resents the authority of the supervisor; the one who is below average in ability, and accuses the supervisor of discrimination and favoritism when promotion is not forthcoming; the one who is an interminable gossip about office affairs that should be kept confidential; the one who "visits," and wastes hours of the time of other employees; the slacker, who apparently believes that the less work done the better the day; and the temperamental one who wants the window closed when the others want it open.

These are not imaginary cases, invented as illustrations, but real ones which have come under my personal observation. Employees

have come into my office and, with tears in their eyes, begged for a transfer to some other situation, anywhere away from their supervisor who was making their lives miserable. They were not malcontents or psychopaths, but cultured, sensitive persons, seeking only to be placed under conditions where they could have some peace of mind and retain their self-respect. Supervisors also have come into my office seeking advice as to what course to pursue or what method to follow in dealing with some subordinate who was making life miserable for them by irrational and unreasonable conduct.

And so we have a perfect illustration of that human relation expressed in the epigram, *The Man on Foot and the Man on Horseback*, or, to adapt it to modern conditions, *The Pedestrian and the Motorist*. Between the two there is a constant state of hostility and antagonism. When they meet their relative positions become acutely accentuated; the man on foot becomes keenly aware of his inferiority, is filled with resentment against the other whom he regards with envy because of his greater possessions, and with hatred, because of the belief that he has suffered deprivation for the other's enrichment; the man on horseback rides by in self-conscious superiority, disdainful of the man on foot, who may be bespattered with mud from the horse's hoofs, or crowded into the gutter as something entitled to no consideration.

There is much of this ages-old antipathy in the relations of supervisor and supervised. It is one phase, and an important phase, of the problem of human relations which exists in every organization, however and for what purpose organized. The act of walking has been described as a perpetual falling with constant self-recovery. So in human relations there is a perpetual recurrence of difficulties necessitating against constant adjustment. We will be disappointed if we expect all supervisors to be like Mr. Milquetoast, or all the supervised to be disciples of Pollyanna.

Now I should like to say something about that doubtful method of seeking relief from a real or fancied hardship or injustice, commonly called "going over the boss's head." I say "doubtful method," because it is rarely used with either discrimination or discretion. Most employees prefer to suffer in silence rather than risk arousing the antagonism of the boss, who has various well-known methods of retaliation at his disposal. The boss is quite within his rights when he insists upon being the channel through which all matters pertaining to the operation of his division or section are brought to the attention of his superiors. This is a fundamental principle of good organization. It has also a reverse application. Orders or directions should come down through the successive stages of authority or responsibility, just as requests or recommendations should go up through these same stages. Because it is easier or more expeditious, a superior may sometimes give directions to a subordinate who is second or third in the line of authority. That is poor administration, since it weakens authority, deprives the one of higher responsibility of full knowledge concerning changes in policy or plan, and may lead to the issuance of conflicting orders or instructions.

There should be no thought of going over the boss's head unless

the grievance is a very real one, and not even then if there remains untried any other legitimate means by which adjustment of the difficulty may be accomplished. On the other hand, the boss should realize that an opportunity to talk over the situation with a "higher up" may bring the employee to a new point of view, and lead to an adjustment of the difficulty. If the higher-up maintains a sympathetic but impartial attitude, and can induce the employee to join in a thorough analysis of all the elements involved in the complaint, from the standpoint of both boss and employee, the chances are more than even that a new and more satisfactory relationship will be established. Many years ago I read a book which made a profound impression upon me at the time, but of which I now recall nothing definite except the title. However, the theme of the book was expressed in the title, which was, "Put yourself in his place." As it seems to me, if the boss and the bossed each made a sincere effort to follow the rule of put yourself in his place; to view, through the eyes of the other, situations which caused provocative words to be uttered, or apparently unjustifiable acts to be committed, fewer cases of misunderstanding would arise, and much criticism on the part of the one and many complaints on the part of the other would be obviated.

The boss should realize also that there are indirect and devious ways in which an employee may go over his head without openly appearing to do so. There is the anonymous letter which frequently leads to the investigation of an alleged injustice. There is also the friend of a friend who may be in position to suggest to a higher-up the desirability of correcting what appears to be a bad situation; or the ever active "grapevine" may be the means through which attention is finally directed to outstanding cases of injustice or discrimination.

An amusing instance of the indirect method occurred during the World War. A young recruit was made very uncomfortable by the regulation clothing issued to him, especially the shoes, which were a decided misfit and were beginning to cause serious injury to his feet. He well knew that complaint to the sergeant was useless, and did not dare go over his head to the medical officer. Finally he obtained leave to go to the neighboring town, where he purchased a pair of comfortable shoes, made of soft leather and bright yellow in color. His appearance in those shoes at inspection the next morning caused quite a commotion, such that for a time he feared he might be due for court-martial. At length the medical officer appeared on the scene and, after inquiry, accepted the recruit's explanation and permitted him to wear his non-regulation shoes as long as he was in camp.

An important point which was emphasized in one of our lectures is the necessity for making a clear definition of objectives in terms of the things desired to be accomplished. Failure to follow this sound and far-reaching principle often results in wasted effort, reduced output of work and lowered morale. To illustrate, let me refer to a case which has come under my personal observation. Since I should not reveal the identity of the persons involved, I ask your indulgence for the very general description which I must use. I have in mind a cer-

tain project which has been under way for a number of years and on which many thousands of dollars have been spent. The equipment and facilities for the work of this project are unsurpassed, and in general the workers receive more than average consideration except in one respect, and that is they do not know, have never been told, the purpose of the work which they do, have never had any intimation of the objective which the leader of the project has in mind. As a result the workers have gradually developed a resentful attitude, have become critical and dissatisfied, and are performing their duties without enthusiasm and in a half-hearted manner. Some have even voiced the opinion that the leader of the project himself has no well-defined objective in mind.

This project leader, perhaps quite unintentionally, has outraged the normal feeling of pride in accomplishment and of satisfaction with work well and intelligently done, just as effectively as a jailer who, as punishment for some infraction of prison rules, requires a prisoner to move a pile of bricks from one side of the yard to another, and, when the job is done, orders them moved back to their original position. Being required to perform work without knowing its purpose induces a feeling of degradation surpassed only by that caused by being forced to perform work with full knowledge that it will accomplish nothing.

It seems to me that this project leader has violated one of the primary principles of leadership, which, one of our lecturers told us, is bringing people to work together for a common end, effectively and happily. If the end or objective is not revealed, the work will suffer in effectiveness, and the workers will certainly not do their work very happily.

Throughout this course of lectures much has been said about leaders and leadership. We should think of leadership as present or absent, rather than as good or bad. If employees are constantly striving to escape from the group to which they are assigned, it is because leadership is wanting, not because it is bad; if these same employees endeavor to join another group where the work is no less difficult and exacting, it is because leadership is present. Our regard or admiration for leadership should be withheld until we have ascertained whether it is exercised for good or for evil. From this point of view contrast the leadership of Napoleon, which caused kingdoms to fall and devastated with fire and sword an entire continent, with that of the gentle Livingston, which inspired his native followers, on his death in the wilds of Africa, to carry his body for 1,000 miles through the trackless jungles to the seacoast, that it might be returned to his native land.

Within an organization, leadership is good only so long as it energizes or promotes action in harmony with the common purpose; but if used for self-aggrandizement, or employed to develop unwholesome or antagonistic rivalry between coequal groups, then such leadership is disadvantageous rather than helpful. Many pages have been written on the art of training men to be good leaders, but apparently far less consideration has been given to the art of training these same men to be good followers. In every organization leaders are superimposed, one above the other, according to the respective authority invested in

each, with the result that each leader is at the same time a follower of the one next above him, and so on until the chief executive is reached. In my judgment, the extent to which the work performed at each level of leadership can be integrated depends no less upon effective functioning, when in the relation of follower, than it does upon the manifestation of successful and well-directed leadership.

If you will indulge me further, I should like to comment briefly on an important part which personnel administration must play, if high standards of service are to be established and maintained. It is taken for granted that you are all supporters of the merit system. Now, the merit system means much more than establishing eligibility for appointment through a civil service examination. It is the basis upon which the superstructure of an efficient public service is erected; it means that merit should be the governing influence from the day of entry into the service until the day of retirement; it means that the public interest must ever be paramount to employee interest. In the maintenance of a high standard of public service there naturally arises the question of the limitation or elimination of the inefficient, the incompetent, the insubordinate and the disloyal. These are cases of which it almost might be said, as Mark Twain remarked about the weather, that everybody talks about them, but no one *does* anything about them. Those of you who have read Dr. Feldman's "Personnel Program for the Federal Service" will recall his comment on the "deep-seated reluctance" of Government supervisors "to dismiss known and proved incompetents, or workers whose habits and conduct should not be encouraged in the service," and also his scathing statement that "it is an easier path to have the public pay for one's lack of courage than to suffer the discomfort which zeal in the exercise of administrative responsibility would entail."

We are not in a position to deny the truth of these allegations, but on the other hand we are also not in a position to deny that there may be cases of demotion or dismissal which are unjust or unwarranted. While there may be supervisors whose attitude toward any form of disciplinary action is so spineless that they might almost be characterized as gaseous invertebrates, there are other supervisors who, if unrestrained, would resort to dismissal or discharge whenever performance or conduct did not measure up to their individual standards. The vesting of the sole power to discharge in the Head of the Department is an insurance against action taken without cool deliberation, and eliminates the practice of "firing on the spot," which is one of the crudest and most elemental displays of authority. To discharge an employee is a matter of serious moment, not only to the individual concerned but also to the organization itself. Unless the cause for discharge is clearly understood, and unless the action can be supported by a body of fact, predetermined by thorough investigation, the effect on the organization may be to arouse feelings of uncertainty and insecurity, with corresponding reduction in morale. Nevertheless, cases are continually arising in which there is no alternative to complete separation from the service. Such action is necessary to avoid lowering the standard of the service, and bringing it and the great body of self-respecting, law-abiding employees into disrepute.

It seems evident that the standard of public service would be improved if the principles set forth in this course were more generally adopted or observed by some of our supervisors or administrators; it also seems evident that improvement of the service would follow the adoption or observance of these same principles by some of our employees who are not of the classes just mentioned. To accomplish this may, to some, seem an impossible task, to others a challenge, a real test of ability to develop higher ideals of public service and human relationship.

The first steamship to cross the Atlantic Ocean carried a supply of printed pamphlets written to prove that such a feat was not possible. Some years ago a brilliant mathematician and a well-known physicist collaborated in the production of a serious technical article to prove that an airplane could not be flown upside down, and just about that time the article appeared in print an adventurous pilot zoomed into the sky and looped the loop.

It seems to be a very human trait to take for granted the existing order of things, to allow the mind to run along in the channels formed by habit, and to be largely unaware of fundamental changes in the physical, economic and social worlds, until, like a rising tide they creep upon us unobserved and threaten to engulf us. In the economic history of the United States, well-defined periods or epochs have been distinguished. According to one classification, there was the period of westward expansion and the exploitation of natural resources; then followed the period of mechanization, or the application of machinery to agriculture and industry; then the period of financial organization, which was followed by the period of commercial expansion. Each of these periods required a leadership, differing in characteristics and quality from that which proved to be successful in each of the others. The change from one period to the next did not come abruptly, but through a gradual transition in which the old order slowly declined and the new order progressively gained in ascendancy. And likewise the banner of leadership passed into the hands of those men who were able to readjust or adapt themselves to the demands of the new epoch.

May I suggest that out of the throes of our great depression will come yet another epoch in our economic history, an epoch in which there will be new tasks to perform and new ways to be found to do the old ones; an epoch in which our ideas of organization and social structure must be modified to fit new conditions; an epoch in which less attention will be paid to money rewards, and more attention to the development of those which give intellectual or spiritual satisfaction; an epoch in which human relations will receive constantly increasing consideration, one in which enlightened public opinion will increasingly demand, the very highest ideals of ethics and integrity in the public service.

And now, in bringing this course of lectures to a close, let me summarize the thoughts which I have been trying to express:

1. Learning can be best accomplished when the mind is freed from prejudicial conclusions, and is amenable to changes in the pattern of the thought habits.

2. Personnel administration is not solely the function of personnel

officers, but is a part of the responsibility of every one who supervises others.

3. Assignment to supervisory responsibilities as a reward for technical proficiency, when executive ability has not been demonstrated, is bad administration, and a prolific source of personnel troubles.

4. A broad general knowledge, sympathetic understanding, and an appreciation of the sciences which touch human relations or behavior, are desirable characteristics of a personnel administrator.

5. Personnel administration must require similar education and training and must receive professional recognition equal to that accorded chemistry, agronomy, economics, and similar subjects.

6. Personal administration, or wise and judicious self-control, is a factor of great magnitude in establishing and maintaining satisfactory human relations.

7. Visualize relations from the other fellow's point of view, "Put yourself in his place."

8. There may be leadership, or there may be lack of it; whether leadership is good or bad, depends upon the motive or purpose of the leader.

9. If a high standard of public service is to be maintained, deadwood must be eliminated.

10. Looking to the future, we may hope to see human relations receive increasing consideration.

* * *

PERSONNEL PROBLEM NO. 9

In the bulletin "A Personnel Program for the Federal Civil Service," on page 110, Dr. Feldman gives the "Elements of a Personnel Program." The sixteen numbered elements are attached for your use, but it would be much better to get the bulletin and read the discussion. However, you are, from our lectures and past reference reading, familiar with all the points involved.

The problem this week will be this program. We want to examine it and, if acceptable, see what can be done to promote it. The following questions are intended to aid you in expressing your opinion of the program and its application.

Go over the sixteen points in the program one by one and record: (1) Which of the sixteen are now satisfactorily taken care of in that branch of the government service in which you work. (2) Which are given fair consideration but scarcely adequate. (3) Which are inadequately handled or almost completely ignored. (4) Based on the instruction in the course, suggest a seventeenth element. (5 to 8) Make four suggestions for the improvement of personnel administration in your organization. (9) How can the Graduate School help.

ELEMENTS OF A PERSONNEL PROGRAM

The kind of program suggested would include a thorough-going analysis of the various conditions affecting the treatment of employees and their morale and efficiency, accompanied by the creation of machinery for promoting those personnel activities regarded as important. Such questions as wages, wage incentives, salary increases, promotion, and similar financial considerations have already been

treated in part 1. The subjects listed below, to be discussed in the remaining chapters, are remaining problems illustrative of the program needed in the federal service.

1. Improvement of the selection process, to assure the recruitment of a superior personnel, the more accurate matching of capacities with assignments, and the proper introduction of employees to the work environment.

2. Use of the interval of probation as a supplementary period for testing qualifications and determining whether an employee shall be permitted to acquire a permanent status in the government service.

3. Enhancement of the prestige of the public service and enlarging the opportunities of a permanent career.

4. Improvement of the capacity of supervisors, through more careful selection of executives and their subsequent training and development.

5. Provision of educational facilities designed to broaden the horizon and to increase the intelligence and efficiency of government employees.

6. Enlistment of the personal interest of employees through various devices, such as carefully drawn up suggestion systems, the provision of well-calculated incentives, the wider practice of forms of recognition and reward, and the use of other methods found successful in modern organizations.

7. Establishment of physical environment conducive to high output and to personal satisfaction with conditions.

8. Study of hours of work, sick leaves and vacations, not merely to secure reasonable uniformity nationally with regard to these matters but to determine optimum working periods and proper energy cycles.

9. Maintenance of activities promoting health and safety and reducing the monotony and strains of work.

10. Study of the conditions of the older workers, with special reference to the reassignments of work, and the revision of some features of the retirement plan regarded as unfair.

11. Compilation of significant figures for labor turnover and their use in an actual program of reducing the ratio of quits.

12. Establishment of a procedure for individual grievances affording a free outlet for the expression of complaints and leading to their prompt adjustment.

13. Provision of machinery for group representation of employees through committees or unions, with the aim of securing constructive cooperation in matters of joint interest.

14. Establishment of a central leadership in personnel activities, with trained personnel administrators at the head and with subordinate personnel officers of similar training in the various departments, divisions, and bureaus.

15. Reconsideration of the present separation and duplication of authority with the purpose of unifying the government's personnel organization.

16. Frequent publication of authoritative reports as to the problems and progress of the government personnel program.

COMMENTS ON DISCUSSION

*Problem No. 9 **

In problem nine the class is given an opportunity to review briefly the entire scope of personnel management as it applies to the federal civil service in Washington. Dr. Feldman's sixteen elements of a personnel program touch very lightly on those features of our course covered in lectures 3, 4 and 5. The reason is that these lectures get over pretty definitely into another field. While dealing directly with personnel and with personnel problems, as shown by many of the cases used for discussion, the techniques of supervision are usually considered as coming under the scope of "business" or "industrial" rather than "personnel" management. Whatever it may properly be called, it is most important and vitally concerns personnel.

The two hundred discussions handed in were extremely interesting in the picture they gave of the group's estimate of the personnel situation here in Washington. Of course conditions are not 100 per cent perfect, and of course they are not the same for all units. All in all, as compared to industry, personnel in the government service is pretty well handled. However, it is surprising how few things were accepted as satisfactory. But as to what is satisfactory and what is not there is considerable divergence of opinion. Seemingly no two persons answered the first three questions exactly alike.

This great diversity of opinion seems to be due to three causes: First, the actual differences that do exist. While laws affecting personnel are the same for all, actual practice varies a great deal. The variations are mostly outside the scope of prescribed rules. Second, there is considerable difference of opinion as to what is satisfactory. A situation or practice that satisfies one will not another. For example, take the element number one, "the selection process." Only 25 per cent called that satisfactory, yet our selection through civil service examination is considered one of the best systems in use anywhere. Further, one of our lecturers, Dr. Donald, told us that the importance of selection has been greatly overestimated; that the best known methods are so inadequate that it doesn't so much matter; that the important thing is what is done with the employee after he is selected. On the other hand, a recent Commission of Inquiry into Public Service Personnel Practices criticized what they call our "pigeon-hole" method of selection—giving a different examination for each of hundreds of jobs.

So there seems to be room for an honest difference of opinion even in the same group. In fact there is not so much difference between groups. The civil service rules apply to all (except to some of the new units) and are strictly and quite uniformly enforced.

The third reason for differences seemed to be that all were not equally well informed as to just what is being done. Some were new in their department or their work had not brought them in contact with action on the element discussed. Possibly this also accounts for the recommendation made by many that employees be given more information about the Department in general.

* This problem was considered as the final examination in the course.

To me the most unexpected opinion was that concerning use of the probation period as a factor in selection. Just about half consider its use satisfactory. This, in spite of the fact that Dr. Feldman says that as a selection device it has been allowed to go by default and is seldom used. This is the opinion also of the Commission recently reporting on Public Service Personnel. They find that probation means little and that appointments almost invariably become permanent. This agrees with my own observation. Yet the test period is a most effective device, if we would only use it, for building up a superior personnel.

As for number six, not one person among us considers that his branch of the service makes satisfactory use of incentives. Sixty per cent say that it is wholly inadequate. These are probably right, but why should it be so? As said in the discussion of a previous problem, no other organization would have as great an appeal to workers if we would only capitalize natural advantages and use them.

Four, eight, eleven, and sixteen are other elements which very few consider are satisfactorily taken care of. Training, number four, is not always advertised as such, so it is quite probable that there is much more of it done than we suspect. At the same time it would be well for administrative officers to give serious consideration to this almost universal belief that it is inadequate.

About 25 per cent believe that the local employee unions give satisfactory employee representation. When one considers the small minority of employees who are members and the further fact that this membership is divided into a number of competing unions or factions, this point of view seems rather optimistic. In its highest and best development "employee representation" has a real constructive value to the organization as well as to the employees.

Element number fourteen suggests the establishment of a central personnel agency to give leadership in personnel matters. Since the Feldman report was written there has been created a Council of Personnel Administration to furnish such leadership. The work of the Council was mentioned in one of our lectures. It has a tremendous task and has been in existence only a short time so it is probably too soon to judge it. The indications are that it will exert a considerable influence toward both unity and improvement.

The recommendation for improvement in reply to questions 5, 6, 7 and 8 are equally as interesting as the comments on the program and, of course, tie in closely to them. That is, the needed improvements in general emphasize the elements that were reported as inadequate. It was gratifying to see that practically all put the needs of the organization above the personal needs of employees. Only a few recommended such things as higher wages, shorter hours and longer leave allowances.

The improvement most recommended is better training; not more schooling but better training on the job and for the job. Fifty per cent of the papers recommend it in some form. Quite a number would require all supervisors to take a special training course in the techniques of supervision. Still others emphasize the need for training

in administration for higher executives. This is in line with the recommendations of the Commission previously mentioned.

About 40 per cent recommended better written instructions and more specific assignments together with better work records and more recognition of the value of records in work control, assignments, transfers and promotions. These and a large number of scattered recommendations recognize the value of the supervision techniques discussed in lectures three, four and five.

Transfers is still a troublesome problem. Too many would make it easy for employees to transfer from one unit to another. Such a method never has given satisfactory results. Transfers to be of value must be planned and controlled. Each employee should be used in the position where he is of most value to the organization, but very few employees themselves are able to say where that is. It usually requires a third party who knows both the man and the job to decide. Transfers should be planned; just shopping round on a hit or miss basis seldom gets results.

Complaints is another difficult problem on which there is not much agreement. Many agree that something should be done about it but just what is still a question. If there is injustice there should be some way for the injured person to get a hearing. This would seem to be a simple matter if approached directly with that end in view, yet most of the methods suggested have been tried elsewhere and without success. One of the dangers is that "boards" or committees be given or assume administrative authority without having any responsibility for getting things done. That the problem is difficult is however no excuse for inaction. Each department or unit will no doubt take care of its own situation, for as we were told in one lecture 99 per cent of all cases should be settled where they originate.

About 20 per cent of those submitting papers believe that it would be a decided improvement if administrative officers would inform their employees, or helpers, as to their objectives. Everyone likes to know the why of things as well as the how. Any work without an objective soon becomes drudgery while any work will become interesting if its purpose is known and approved. Everyone likes to feel that their work is contributing to something worthwhile.

Quite a number believe that we should have better personnel offices. From what was said I did not get the idea that this was intended as a criticism of the individuals now holding personnel positions, but rather that the scope of the work should be broadened along the lines discussed in the course and the improvements that these papers suggest. And here again there is a similarity between the suggestions of the class and the recommendations of the Commission reporting on Public Service Personnel. Yet it is not probable that a single member of the class had read the report. This suggests, does it not, that both the Commission and the class are well informed on personnel administration and personnel needs in the federal civil service.

BOOKS ON PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED SUBJECTS IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL LIBRARY

Baridon, F. E., and Loomis, E. H.

Personnel problems; methods of analysis and control. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1931.

Clark, Wallace.

The Gantt chart; a working tool of management. New York, Ronald Press, 1922. Commission of inquiry on public service personnel. Better government personnel, 1935.

Craig, D. R., and Charters, W. W.

Personal leadership in industry. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1925.

Dennison, Henry.

Organization engineering. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1931.

Diemer, Hugo.

Industrial organization and management. Chicago, LaSalle Extension University, 1920.

Donald, W. J., editor.

Handbook of business administration. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1931.

Feldman, Herman.

A personnel program for the federal civil service. Washington, Government Printing, 1931. (71st Congress, 3d session. House Doc. 773.)

Galloway, Lee.

Office management; its principles and practice. New York, Ronald Press Company, 1921.

Gardiner, G. L.

Practical office supervision. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1929.

Gowin, E. B.

The Executive and his control of men. New York, Macmillan, 1919.

Gowin, E. B.

Developing executive ability. New York, Ronald Press, 1919.

Hepner, H. W.

Human relations in changing industry. New York, Prentice-Hall, 1934.

Loveridge, E. W.

Job-load analysis and planning of executive work in National Forest Administration. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1932. Published by Forest Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

McClure, M. T.

How to think in business. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1923.

Metcalf, H. C., editor.

Business management as a profession. Chicago & New York, A. W. Shaw Co., 1927.

Metcalf, H. C., editor.

Scientific foundations of business administration. Baltimore, Williams and Wilkins, 1926.

Schell, E. H.

The technique of executive control. Edition 4. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1934.

Scott, W. D., Clothier, R. C., and Mathewson, S. B.

Personnel management; principles, practices and point of view. Edition 2. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1931.

Scott, W. D., and Hayes, M. H. S.

Science and common sense in working with men. New York, Ronald Press, 1921.

Smith, E. D.

Psychology for executives. Rev. Ed. New York, Harper & Bros., 1934.

Tead, Ordway.

The art of leadership. New York, Whittlesey House (McGraw-Hill), 1935.

Tead, Ordway.

Human nature and management. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1929.

Tead, Ordway, and Metcalf, H. C.

Personnel administration; its principles and practice. Edition 3. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1933.

Williams, J. H.

The flexible budget. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1934.

Periodicals

The Personnel Journal. v. 1-date. May 1922-date. Published bi-monthly for the Personnel Research Federation, by the Williams and Wilkins Company, Baltimore.

Bulletin of the Taylor Society (since Nov. 1934, Bulletin of the Taylor Society and of the Society of Industrial Engineers). Vol. 1, 1914-date. New York.





GRADUATE SCHOOL COLLECTION





